VOLUME TEN

NUMBER TWO

Duke University Library
JUN 21 1943
Durham, N. C.

ELH

A Journal of English Literary History

JUNE, 1943

CONTENTS

HUGHES, MERRITT Y.—*Milton as a Revolutionary* 87

GOTTFRIED, RUDOLF B.—*The Early Development of the Section on Ireland in Camden's 'Britannia'* 117

SHUDOFSKY, M. MAURICE.—*Charles Johnson and Eighteenth-Century Drama* 131

EWING, MAJL.—*Musical Settings of Prior's Lyrics in the 18th Century* 159

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

ELH

A Journal of English Literary History

Edited By

EDWARD T. NORRIS, *Managing Editor*

DON CAMERON ALLEN — THOMAS PYLES

LEON HOWARD — LOUIS TEETER

CLIFFORD P. LYONS — EARL WASSERMAN

A PUBLICATION OF THE TUDOR AND STUART CLUB OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

Tudor and Stuart Club Committee on Publications

RAYMOND D. HAVENS — KEMP MALONE

JOHN C. FRENCH — L. WARDLAW MILES

HAZELTON SPENCER

Issued quarterly, in March, June, September and December. Subscription Price $2.50 a year, 75 cents a copy.

Contributions, accompanied by return postage, should be addressed to the Editors of *ELH*, The Tudor and Stuart Club, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Subscriptions, remittances and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Maryland.

Entered as second-class matter March 22, 1935, at the Postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY J. H. FURST COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

ELH

A Journal of English Literary History

VOLUME TEN JUNE, 1943 NUMBER TWO

MILTON AS A REVOLUTIONARY *

By MERRITT Y. HUGHES

Since the end of World War I there has been a growing doubt of Milton's rank among the leaders of the Puritan revolution. In part, as we shall see, it has taken the form of discontent like Mr. Don Wolfe's with his failure to anticipate the proletarian gospels of the twentieth century as well as he did the liberal faith of the nineteenth. In part it has taken the form of submergence of Milton in the growing doubt of the economic wisdom and disinterestedness of Puritan religion among historians like Max Weber and R. H. Tawney.[1] And in part it has paradoxically arisen from the research of Miltonists in the pamphlet literature of the English Civil War. For a time after Professor Haller's publication of his volumes of *Tracts on Liberty in the Puritan Revolution*[2] it seemed that Milton's preeminence as a thinker among the spokesmen of his party might, from our point of view, suffer some loss of apparent originality and courage, and that from the point of view of his own contemporaries he might have to yield his claim to have seriously influenced public opinion with any of his tracts earlier than the *Defence of the English People*. Professor Parker's Introduction to the pamphlets which he has published in *Milton's Contemporary Reputation*, and their evidence as corroborated by the

* Lecture before the Tudor and Stuart Club, Jan. 25, 1943.

[1] Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, translated by Talcott Parsons, with a Foreword by R. H. Tawney (New York, 1930); and R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism. A Historical Study* (London, 1929).

[2] Three volumes, edited by William Haller (New York, 1934).

tract called *The Dignity of Kingship Asserted*[3] have in part restored our belief in Milton's increasing influence from 1649, if not earlier, until 1660. The question of the influence of *Areopagitica*, the tracts on divorce, and the anti-episcopal tracts may never be answered to the satisfaction of historians. For us, however, that question may not be crucial. Whatever its answer may be, no one is likely to deny Milton a place among the world's typical revolutionists—" Hampden, Sir Harry Vane, . . . , Sam Adams, John Hancock, Washington, Thomas Paine, Lafayette, Marat, Talleyrand, Hebert, Miliukov, Konavalov, Kerensky, Chichirin, Lenin "—a list in which Professor Brinton places[4] him third.

Perhaps at bottom our modern dissatisfaction with Milton as a revolutionary thinker springs from the fact that he himself habitually regarded the Puritan Revolution as a late and perhaps final stage in the Protestant Reformation; that his first political tracts, the five anti-episcopal pamphlets, were ecclesiastical; that his supposedly antifeminist defence[5] of free divorce rested mainly on biblical grounds; that *Areopagitica*—though it is still the literary charter of freedom of conscience and of the press—is full of religious passion and fails to grant toleration to Roman Catholics and atheists; and that—as Macaulay pointed out over a century ago—the 'Arianism' of his great theological work, the *Christian Doctrine*, has distracted attention from his really more 'startling' opinions " respecting the nature of the Deity, the eternity of matter, and the observation of the Sabbath."[6] In various ways we all find the Protestantism of Milton's Protestant religion a little hard to swallow. For Catholics like Mr. Belloc his 'Arianism' is still a stumbling-block, and it is refreshing to find a theologian like Mr. G. Wilson Knight correcting Mr. Belloc about Milton's 'unitarianism' and quoting the *Christian Doctrine* itself to prove that for Milton " the nature of the Son " was " indeed divine."[7] Yet,

[3] W. R. Parker, *Milton's Contemporary Reputation* (Columbus, 1940) and W. R. Parker, editor of *The Dignity of Kingship Asserted* (New York, 1942).

[4] Crane Brinton, *The Anatomy of Revolution* (New York, 1938), p. 116.

[5] The case for Milton as continuator of the revolutionary thought of the sixteenth century about divorce is admirably made by Allan H. Gilbert in " Milton on the Position of Women," *Modern Language Review* 15 (1920). 240-64.

[6] *Critical and Historical Essays by Thomas Babington Macaulay* (London and Toronto, 1924) I. 151.

[7] G. Wilson Knight, *Chariot of Wrath* (London, 1942), p. 114.

as is inevitable from his general position in *Chariot of Wrath*, Mr. Knight simply cannot recognize the sterner, historical, revolutionary implications of Milton's demand in the *Christian Doctrine* and in the *Likeliest Means to Remove Hirelings out of the Church* for separation of Church and State. Mr. Knight's *Chariot* will engage us more than once in the course of this discussion, and its robust transvaluations of parts of Milton's political thought, while we may not sympathize with them, will help to throw its true, revolutionary character into high relief. Mr. Knight's case seems to be somewhat like that of the late Paul Elmer More, who, as Mr. Alfred Kazin has just said,[8] had the paradoxical gift of combining a "passionate love of Milton's poetry" with a fondness for Dr. Johnson's "strictures on Milton's politics." Although Mr. Knight quotes[9] Dr. Johnson's charge that "Milton's republicanism was . . . founded in an envious hatred of greatness, and a sullen desire of independence, in petulant impatience of control, and pride disdainful of superiority," and even "half-subscribes" to it, *Chariot of Wrath* in the main treats Milton's politics in a very unrevolutionary though fulgurously apocalyptic light. Although some of his historical interpretation of Milton's political thought must be challenged, Mr. Knight's more than Wordsworthian faith that Milton should be with us at this hour is a corrective for those who study him only in the light of the prevailing Marxian view of Protestantism as a mere 'reflex' of a "society based upon the production of commodities," for which "the most fitting form of religion" is "Christianity with its *cultus* of abstract man, more especially in its bourgeois developments, Protestantism, Deism, &c."[10]

In *Chariot of Wrath* Milton's Protestantism is transformed into a messianic faith of the most urgent application to both the Puritan Revolution and World War II. Since Mr. Knight's main interest is in the contemporary scene, while ours primarily is in Milton's part in the historic drama of the Puritan Revolution, the importance of his book for us lies in its treatment of Milton's stand in such crucial questions of the Revolution as

[8] *On Native Grounds* (New York, 1942), p. 309. [9] *Chariot of Wrath*, p. 32.
[10] Karl Marx, *Capital, A Critique of Political Economy*, edited by Frederick Engels, revised and amplified according to the fourth German edition by Ernest Untermann, Modern Library, New York, p. 91.

the relation of Church to State and the value of monarchy, both as represented by Charles I and as an institution abstractly regarded. On those matters and on Milton's treatment of the questions of freedom, discipline, and the choice and function of an aristocracy, and above all on the idea of truth in *Areopagitica* as related to the 'dynamics' of the Revolution Mr. Knight has much to say that is pertinent to our view of Milton as a revolutionist. What we find on these topics in *Chariot of Wrath* inevitably challenges attention, yet none of these secondary features of the book can fairly be discussed apart from its main, messianic theme.

In *Areopagitica*, the *Defences of the English People*, and to some extent in all Milton's political writing Mr. Knight sees a prophetic message to England, both in the seventeenth and in the twentieth centuries, which culminates in *Paradise Lost*. Briefly, it consisted in an apocalyptic vision of "England, or Great Britain, . . . as . . . a Messiah-nation."[11] That, Mr. Knight tells us, was Milton's view of his country, and it is his own also. For Mr. Knight sees "Great Britain in the Renaissance era (in which we live) as having assumed the power-content of the medieval Christian Church," and as laboring, "without any conscious recognition (outside her greater poets) of this destiny, . . . on the whole, . . . to curb lust for power and tyrannic ambition"[12] in a world of strife. The Christ of *Paradise Regained* and *Paradise Lost* seems to Mr. Knight a symbol of "some great, vice-gerent (to use Milton's habitual phrase) responsibility, under God,"[13] which is England's destiny. He sees the "Cromwellian revolution" less as social and political than as military and religious, and as a part of a continuous defence of the "Christian structure" of the world which "Great Britain is today defending."[14]

It is hardly necessary to follow Mr. Knight to the end of his interpretation of contemporary events in the light of the role of Messiah in *Paradise Lost*. The drama in Book V will not gain much in artistic value even if we assent to the suggestion that "Satan's sense of injustice under the enthronement of Messiah as God's vice-gerent exactly reflects Germany's view

[11] *Chariot of Wrath*, p. 20.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 140.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 141.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 143.

of Great Britain's ascendency";[15] nor will the English constitutional monarchy gain much prestige from Mr. Knight's view of the Messiah who vanquishes Satan with thunder and lightning in Book VI as "an especially *constitutional monarch*, in its [*sic*] more divine, upreaching aspect, as a carrier of God's grace into the domain of secular action."[16] What Mr. Knight means, he explains, is that the English conception of both royal and national character is "an incarnation of that royalty blending justice and mercy defined once and for all by Portia's speech in *The Merchant of Venice*."[17] The Shakespearian parallel may seem far-fetched; it is one of many, all of which are due to Mr. Knight's conviction that the Puritan Revolution itself was a spiritual, though violent, process of "re-creation" of the British constitution and "a fulfillment in actuality and through long time of the Shakespearian vision."[18]

In essence this belief in Milton (though hardly in Shakespeare) as a political prophet with something like an Old Testament seer's inspiration, and with something like the charisma which Lenin's disciples recognize in their master, is nothing new under the sun. Mr. Knight finds some encouragement for it in Sir Herbert Grierson's study of the poet as prophet in *Milton and Wordsworth*. He finds very much more encouragement in Mr. Middleton Murry's *Heaven and Earth* though the concern of that book with Milton is hardly vital. If his faith in the working of the leaven of the Puritan Revolution beyond British bounds had been wide enough to admit Russia and the United States further into his book than the footnote on pages 184-5, his faith in the contemporary power of Milton's vision might be greater than it is. Without sacrificing his fondness for an apocalyptic attitude toward Milton, he might have looked at the Puritan Revolution as an international thing, with its roots far in the past, even the pagan past, as Shelley did in *A Philosophical View of Reform*; or he might have seen it in the image of Shelley's eagle in *Hellas*, sweeping down all recorded time and across at least all Europe:

> From age to age, from man to man,
> It lived, and lit from land to land—
> Florence, Albion, Switzerland.

[15] *Ibid.*
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 150.
[17] *Ibid.*
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 171.

It is worth while to remember that to most historians—and even to a revolutionary historian like Prince Kropotkin, whose work on the French Revolution set the example of going behind constitutional changes to economic upheavals as the central factor in such movements—the movement in England "between 1648 and 1688" [19] has been spiritually linked to every subsequent revolutionary attempt on the continent. Mr. Knight's chauvinistically messianic view of Milton in the Puritan revolution obscures the full value of his political thought. To understand that we must go to the magnificent analysis of his sympathy with Sir Henry Vane and the Fifth Monarchists of another Canadian, Mr. Arthur Barker, in *Milton and the Puritan Dilemma*.[20] Mr. Knight's effort in *Chariot of Wrath* to make Milton a figure whose leadership we can follow today is too far removed both from sound historical scholarship and modern political faith to be as moving as Macaulay's picture of Milton's active years as "the very crisis of the great conflict between Oromasdes and Arimanes, liberty and despotism, reason and prejudice." If Milton's principles have "worked their way into the depths of the American forests, . . . and, from one end of Europe to another, . . . kindled an unquenchable fire in the hearts of the oppressed, and loosed the knees of the oppressors with an unwonted fear," it is mainly on account of the prophetic force of the controversial works. Macaulay ranked the best of Milton's prose with the first two books of *Paradise Lost*. His admiration for the "devotional and lyric rapture" of Milton's controversial writing could treat it as describable only in the poet's "own majestic language [as] a sevenfold chorus of hallelujahs and harping symphonies." [21] Macaulay yields nothing in appreciation of the apocalyptic and prophetic element in Milton to Mr. Knight; and he may remind us that the more we know of the inward history of modern liberty, the greater must become our interest in Milton.

Our habit of regarding the Puritan Revolution as the beginning of civil liberty and modern constitutional government in England makes us forget its originally ecclesiastical, and perhaps genuinely religious, nature. In this country we are most

[19] *The Great French Revolution*, translated by N. F. Dryhurst (1909), p. 3.
[20] University of Toronto Press, 1943. See particularly chapter 12.
[21] *Critical and Historical Essays by T B. Macaulay* I. 171 and 192.

accustomed to think of the Revolution in terms of the civil liberties that we associate with *Areopagitica*. In England it is regarded mainly as a landmark in constitutional history. English historians lay greatest stress, as a recent biographer of John Pym [22] does, upon the clarity with which the final constitutional issues of the Civil War were understood and stated as early as June, 1642, in "The Nineteen Propositions" of Parliament to Charles. They included, it will be remembered, the demands that the chief Ministers of State should be "such as shall be approved by both Houses of Parliament"; that the government and liturgy of the Church should be reformed "as both Houses of Parliament shall advise"; that the King should accept Parliament's control of the militia, and that he should agree "by act of Parliament, to clear . . . the five members of the House of Commons [whose privilege he had violated by causing their arrest on the floor of the House], in such manner that future Parliaments may be secured from the consequence of that evil precedent." If we are to understand Milton's mixed role as both religious prophet and political philosopher to the Puritan Revolution, we have to relate him alike to its religious and political sides. To understand him fully we need to be reminded, as we are by Professor Merriman, writing from the point of view of a comparison of the Puritan Revolution with its five contemporary revolts—the Fronde, the struggle between the Stadtholders and the Estates in Holland, and the revolts in Naples, Portugal and Catalonia,—that the Puritan movement was unique in being centrally religious, or at least ecclesiastical. Disregarding the force of the physical and rhetorical support that rallied around Charles after the break with Parliament in 1642, Dr. Merriman thinks that, before the quarrel of the Commons with Archbishop Laud confused the issues, Charles could find no supporters willing to fight "for the royal prerogative as he conceived it." "The Church issue," he adds, "in the last analysis, was the fundamental cause of the Great Civil War. 'Let religion be our *primum quaerite*,' declared Sir Benjamin Rudyerd in 1642, 'for all things are bot etceteras to it.'" [23]

[22] S. Reed Brett in *John Pym* (London, 1940), pp. 222-3.

[23] Roger Bigelow Merriman, *Six Contemporary Revolutions* (Oxford, 1938), p. 38.

As a revolutionist Milton ought first to be known as a volunteer in the attack by the sects, with the Presbyterians in the lead, upon the bishops. Except for their autobiographical passages, such as the famous resolve in the Preface to the second book of *The Reason of Church Government* to write something, someday, that would be the fruit of "devout prayers to that eternal Spirit, who can enrich with all utterance and knowledge, and sends out his seraphim, with the hallowed fire of his altar, to touch and purify the lips of whom he pleases,"[24] those pamphlets are too little read to contribute to the popular view of Milton. Even their scattered bits of autobiography are too seldom understood as the writer's response to the conventional expectation of his public that he should prove his right to be heard by 'ethical argument' or vindication of his own character. The apocalyptic note in this passage is more easily interpreted today as evidence of morbid egotism or hypocrisy than as a logical part of the selfjustification that readers trained in Aristotelian rhetoric expected.[25] What seemed to the seventeenth century audience a rather casual and probably convincing proof of sincerity now excites suspicion, and we need the word of a scholar like Sir Herbert Grierson to assure us that Mr. Hilaire Belloc is wrong in saying that "the first prelatical tracts mark no new experience, no awakening in Milton."[26] So disingenuous do the five anti-episcopal tracts seem to a Miltonophobe like the late Heinrich Mutschmann that he convinced himself[27] that they were the cowardly attempt of a man just returned to England after seeking refuge from ecclesiastical censorship in Italy, to take advantage of the defeat of Archbishop Laud and Charles in the Second Bishops' War. It *is* true that Milton began to write his anti-episcopal tracts about the time that the Root-and-Branch Bill in the House of Commons indicated the rising strength of the opposition to the bishops. It is also true, however, that there is no more reason for doubting the sincerity of Milton's work in the five tracts against them than there is to doubt his sincerity in his attack

[24] The Columbia *Milton* (hereafter cited as *CM*) 3. 241.

[25] The point is well made in *Milton's Rhetoric* (Columbia, Missouri, 1939) *passim*, by Dr. Wilbur E. Gilman.

[26] *Milton and Wordsworth* (London, 1937), p. 32.

[27] In "Die Beweggrunde zu Miltons Festlandreise," *Beiblatt zur Anglia* 50 (1939). 278-82.

on the "blind mouths" in *Lycidas*. Of the perfect harmony of that passage in thought and imagery with the anti-episcopal pamphlets of Milton and his Smectymnuan friends there is abundant evidence in Professor Haller's analysis of that literature in *The Rise of Puritanism*. "Milton's poem, with its extraordinary denunciation of the prelatical church, . . . was an expression of the same spirit which . . . was at the moment clamoring in the reckless pamphlets of Prynne and Lilburne." [28]

Milton's quarrel with the bishops is sometimes explained as a personal affair arising out of his differences with the authorities at Cambridge and his fancy of himself as "church-outed by the prelates." [29] It was, of course, something very much larger than any personal interest of his or than any professional interest of the Presbyterian clergy represented by the five Smectymnuan divines. It rallied men of many professions—not only Lilburne and Prynne, but the lawyers and merchants in the Long Parliament who in 1641 pushed the Root-and-Branch Bill against the resistance of cooler men, such as Henry Robinson,[30] who were bent on the reform of episcopacy, though not on its destruction. Instead of regarding Milton's contempt for the bishops as either a personal or a sectarian prejudice, we should recognize it as something deeply involved in the social life of his time. As the constant, perhaps naive, glimpses in the anti-episcopal tracts of a better world to be had simply by erasing the courts and exactions and secular ambitions of the bishops would indicate, there was something utopian in the revolt against them. There was something utopian not only in the ordinary sense of the word, but also in Karl Mannheim's sense, as he defines it in *Ideology and Utopia*. The bitter, indiscriminate attack on episcopacy by "the ascendant bourgeosie" to which Milton belonged was a part of their ideal of 'freedom,' which Mannheim acknowledges as "in part a real utopia, *i. e.*, it contained elements orientated toward the realization of a new social order which were instrumental in disintegrating the previously existing order, and which, after their realization, did become translated into reality." [31] Certainly it is not fantastic to see the

[28] William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* (New York, 1938), p. 288.
[29] *CM* 3. 242.
[30] See W. K. Jordan, *Men of Substance* (Chicago, 1942), pp. 107-8.
[31] Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia* (London, 1936), p. 183.

anti-episcopal tracts as a part of a wide-spread thrust against the " static guild and cast order " inherited by Milton's England from the " status-bound, feudal society " of the past, and as contributing to the sense of " political freedom and freedom of the unhampered development of the personality " which Mannheim makes central in the conception of liberty that the nineteenth century inherited from the seventeenth.

On the whole, discussion of Milton's anti-episcopal tracts ignores or depreciates their importance as expressions of a revolutionary mind. Few commentators have been enough excited by the spirit of the controversy to accept the ' scurrility ' of the liveliest onslaughts against Bishop Hall and to judge the lampooning passages, as Professor French does,[32] objectively, and simply from the point of view of their fitness for their controversial ends. Less urbane than Bishop Hall Milton certainly was; and he made no pretense of writing with the philosophic scope of Richard Hooker's *Law of Ecclesiastical Polity*, with which his *Reason of Church Government* and *Of Reformation in England* have recently been unfavorably compared.[33] His tracts are to be judged by rhetorical standards such as apply to Tom Paine's *Common Sense*, not by those by which we measure Burke's *Reflections on the French Revolution* or Hooker's treatise. And we should not be misled by the immaturity of their thought. If it is true that in the anti-episcopal tracts he accepted—implicity or explicity—the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination which he repudiated in a famous passage in *Areopagitica* and condemned in the *Christian Doctrine*; it is also true that at the end of the first book of *The Reason of Church Government* he anticipated the ground of his charter of the freedom of the press and of conscience, as well as of the human will, in *Areopagitica*, by answering those who argued that episcopacy was necessary to keep the warring Protestant sects in order in a sentence which reads as if it had been written in 1644 rather than two years earlier:

No wonder then in the reforming of a church, which is never brought to effect without the fierce encounter of truth and falsehood

[32] See John Milton French, " Milton as Satirist," *PMLA* 51 (1936). 414-29; and Haller, *Rise of Puritanism*, pp. 358-61.

[33] See E. N. S. Thompson, " Richard Hooker among the Controversialists," *Philological Quarterly* 20 (1941). 263-4.

together, if, as it were the splinters and shares of so violent a jousting, there fall from between the shock many fond errors and fanatic opinions, which, when truth has the upper hand, and the reformation shall be perfected, will easily be rid out of the way, or kept so low, as that they shall be only the exercise of our knowledge, not the disturbance or interruption of our faith.[34]

The man who wrote these words was already a tolerationist in religion. At the core of his willingness to encourage theological discussion was the respect for "the dignity and importance of the individual" which Mr. Tillyard sees as animating "the whole discussion about the episcopacy."[35] And in that respect for the individual's dignity there was bound up the implicit utopianism (in Mannheim's sense of the word) which had inspired the emotionally valid part of the attack on the bishops from the days of the old Martin Marprelate in Queen Elizabeth's times to the appearance of the new Marprelate tracts at the height of the controversy against Archbishop Laud. Without reading long and widely in the literature of attack upon the prelates between the two Marprelates it is impossible to understand its tremendous utopian drive. The puritan conscience was not only convinced, as Sir Herbert Grierson says,[36] that the quarrel was one "between the ethical in religion and the magical." The revolt was not only against the liturgy and against the whole inheritance of the English Church from Rome which the Puritans stigmatized as idolatry; it was against the interference of the bishops' authority and of their ecclesiastical courts with private lives, private studies, and private beliefs.

A good example of this almost traditional anti-episcopal literature, which happens to date from the year 1614, when the tract found a publisher in Amsterdam, is Leonard Busher's *Religions Peace, or a Reconciliation, between Princes and Peoples, and Nations.* The writer, who described himself as a citizen of London and also "of the Country of Gloucester, of the Town of Wotton," wrote in a style and orthography quaint even for the time; and he wrote with a humble man's sense of his own presumption in speaking at all, but with an apostle's certainty of what he had to say. The tract is less liberal than Milton's *Reason of Church Government,* but it has quite as

[34] *CM* 3. 224. [35] E. M. W. Tillyard, *Milton* (New York, 1930), p. 127.
[36] *Milton and Wordsworth,* p. 42.

utopian a faith in the better world to be easily and instantly attained by the liquidation of the bishops. Busher saw them as responsible by their interference with men's consciences for all the religious hypocrisy in the world. He saw them as responsible by their administration of canon law in their courts for all the domestic unhappiness in England, and he was as naively convinced as Milton was in *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* that with the disappearance of canon law there would not be an unhappy husband or wife, or a single case of adultery in the land. And of course he was profoundly certain that all of England's political woes came from the interference of the prelates at court.

That last thesis Milton takes for granted in a way which modern readers can hardly understand, and which indeed can hardly be understood, either intellectually or emotionally, without an acquaintance with William Prynne's amazing indictment of ambitious churchmen from the very beginning of the Archbishopric of Canterbury under Augustine at the end of the sixth century down to the contemporary encroachments on the rights of both the crown and its subjects by Archbishop Laud. Milton's accusations (some of them resting on a mistaken attribution of the commentary of the Frenchman, Herveus Burgidolensis, to St. Anselm of Canterbury)[37] against the bishops were recognized by his more learned readers as a kind of popularization of the mass of historical 'evidence' against them which William Prynne had published in 1641 in *The Antipathie of the English Lordly Prelacie both to regall monarchy, and civill unity*. In 1641 and still in 1642, of course, when Charles, it was hoped, might yet be weaned away from Laud, there seemed to be good ground for Prynne's strategy; that is why, in the latter year, Milton thought fit to end the *Reason of Church Government* with his famous appeal to Charles to assert his prerogative as head of the English Church against the 'innovations' which Laud was making in its liturgy. In the light of Prynne's theory and in that of its curious appeal to the laws of the realm as a veiled but shrewd threat, if the king will not come to terms with the anti-episcopal party, to constrain him by legal pressure to

[37] I am indebted for this explanation of Milton's mistake (which is found in *CM* 8. 208) to Dom Anselm Strittmatter of St. Anselm's Priory, Brookland, D. C.

do so, the passage is worth quoting. In *Chariot of Wrath* [38] Mr. Knight is attracted by Milton's identification of Charles with Samson in this passage, and he parallels it with some other places in the prose works where Milton uses Samson, as Mr. Knight sees him doing again in *Samson Agonistes*, as a symbol of "Nietzschean 'chastity' and power. In Milton's comparison of Samson's hair to the laws of England, which ought to be the king's glory, and which he cannot harm without losing his strength, it is perhaps more instructive to see, as Mr. Don Wolfe does,[39] the beginning of the open charge of tyranny against Charles which was to be pressed home years later in *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* and the First *Defence of the English People*. Although Mr. Knight says nothing about the significance of Milton's comparisons of the king's flowing locks to the laws, he fully understands the importance of the Puritans' faith that they had law on their side against Charles, and when it comes to the legal issue between the king and Parliament he roundly contradicts [40] Mr. Belloc's "contention that the doctrine concerned was 'wholly new' and to Englishmen 'unnatural.'" Milton's words, it must be acknowledged, do suggest the unction of *Thus Spake Zarathustra*:

> I cannot better liken the state and person of a king than to that mighty Nazarite Samson, who being disciplined from his birth in the precepts and practice of temperance and sobriety, without the strong drink of injurious and excessive desires, grows up to a noble strength and perfection with those his illustrious and sunny locks, the laws, waving and curling about his godlike shoulders. And while he keeps them about him undiminished and unshorn, he may with the jawbone of an ass, that is, with the word of his meanest officer, suppress and put to confusion thousands of those that rise against his just power. But laying down his head among the strumpet flatteries of prelates, while he sleeps and thinks no harm, they wickedly shaving off those bright and weighty tresses of his laws, and just prerogatives, which were his ornament and strength, deliver him over to indirect and violent counsels, which, as those Philistines, put out the fair and far-sighted eyes of his natural discerning, and make him grind in the prison-house of their sinister ends; . . . till he, knowing this prelatical razor to have bereft him of his wonted might, nourish again his puissant hair, the golden

[38] P. 96.
[39] Don Wolfe, *Milton in the Puritan Revolution* (New York, 1941), pp. 46-7.
[40] *Chariot of Wrath*, p. 48.

beams of law and right; and they sternly shook, thunder with ruin upon the heads of those his evil counsellors, but not without great affliction to himself.[41]

2

Few passages are more significant of the working of Milton's mind as he thought about the Puritan Revolution in Church and State than is this one from the close of *The Reason of Church Government Urged against Prelaty*. If we look at it in the light of Mannheim's distinction between ideological and utopian thinking, we find the strong elements of both types, which his analysis would lead us to expect. Nothing is more characteristic of the 'ideologies' of ascendant classes than the sincere, or canting, or cynical notion that the law is on their side, and the first act of a class which is translating its 'utopian' thinking into reality is to make sure that the law *is* interpreted as being on its side. When Milton wrote these words in 1642, just such a translation of 'utopian' intentions was visibly beginning in the ecclesiastical realm, and it was soon to begin in politics. In the opening duel between the crown and parliament it was not yet clear which party would find the common and constitutional law on its side. And it is worth while to remember that for many historians in the twentieth century it is no longer possible to give Macaulay's confident answer to the question; "Had Charles the First broken the fundamental laws of England?"[42]

Charles, of course, was blind enough to identify the law with his own prerogative, and in *Eikon Basilike* he (or Bishop Gauden, or whoever it was that wrote the passage) was fatuous enough to compare his resistance of Parliament's demands to the replies of Christ to the Devil in the temptation on the pinnacle of the Temple in Jerusalem. To such an impertinent and unflattering analogy Parliament's advocate could only answer as Milton did in *Eikonoklastes*[43] by recalling the "zeal to justice and their native liberty, against the proud contempt and misrule of their kings," of the lords who brought Richard II to book for his tyranny and of all the other champions of the liberties which Englishmen were supposed once for all to have secured from the crown in *Magna Charta*.

[41] *CM* 3. 276. [42] *Op. cit.*, p. 174. [43] *CM* 5. 125.

The story of the reply of Charles's clerical supporters to such sharp, two-edged, legal reasoning as this by their appeal to the principle of the king's divine right [44] is too well known to need repeating, and so is that of the support of absolutist principles later by writers like Robert Filmer and Hobbes. To both theological and philosophical absolutism the reply, as Professor Woodhouse points out in his exceedingly able discussion of the service of Puritanism to the cause of liberty,[45] had to be in terms of something still more absolute. "Nothing could dissipate the divinity that hedged a king save the divinity of religion itself when religion was ranged against him." Because Charles chose to make common cause with Archbishop Laud and the more reactionary bishops, it was easy to represent what Milton regarded as the completing or 'reforming' of the Reformation in England as vitally involved with Parliament's case against the king. Charles made the mistake of solidifying everything that was revoltuionary in the English Church against himself. At the same time his own very religious nature and the religious position of many of his supporters at the outset of the struggle finally threw most liberal thinkers, such as John Selden, into opposition to him. Among educated readers the royalists soon had reason to fear the influence of Selden's theory [46] of natural law as more favorable to human rights than to royal prerogative. The royalist John Bramhall, defending the monarchical principle in 1644, in *The Serpent Salve; or, A Remedy for the biting of an Aspe*, warned against the "far-fetched conclusions drawn by empirics from the law of Nature and Nations." What was this Charter of Nature? Whatever it was, Bramhall replied, "it might be limited by the King, his title being not election but conquest." [47] Against this claim the

[44] See John N. Figgis, *The Divine Right of Kings*, second edition (Cambridge, 1922).

[45] A. S. P. Woodhouse, Introduction to *The Army Debates*, edited from the Clarke Manuscripts as *Puritanism and Liberty* (London, 1938), p. 61.

[46] In *De Jure Naturale*, Book I, especially chapters 8, 98, and 99.

[47] Quoted by G. P. Gooch and H. J. Laski in *English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, 1927), p. 93. A typical challange to the royalist claim to absolute rights of power by virtue of the Norman conquest occurs in an anonymous tract, published in 1642, *The Unlimited Prerogative of Kings subverted* (p. B 2r), where the reader learns that William obtained the throne only by the conditional submission of the Saxons, who agreed to serve him "as our Liege Lord, and Sovereigne, so that he would promise to govern us, according to these Laws and Customes to which covenant he consented, as all the Kings of *England* have done since."

first line of defence was the stand taken by Milton in *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* when he asserted that, beginning with William the so-called Conqueror himself, every king of England since Saxon times had sworn in his coronation oath to abide by the laws of the realm.[48] The second and perhaps for both sides the more dangerous line of defence, however, was the Puritan and liberal assertion against royalist claims to divine right and every kind of absolute prerogative for the king of the essentially religious law of nature. In *A Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth* in 1660 Milton recalled his many past appeals to it in a passage calling it the "only law of laws, . . . fundamental to mankind," and "the beginning and end of government."[49] In his most characteristic thinking the law of nature became simply the law of the intellectual and moral integrity of the individual: The "light of nature," he wrote in the *Commonwealth*, equals "right reason,"[50] and the latter is the former's best interpreter. In saying this Milton spoke a language which had been familiar to his countrymen since Robert Greville, Lord Brooke, had appealed against the bishops in 1642 to "Right Reason, the Candle of God, which He hath lighted in man."[51] Already in that tract humanistically trained Puritans found their sanction of the originally Stoic conception of Right Reason interpreting natural law raised by one of the most intellectual and aristocratic of their leaders to a level of philosophical authority that seemed more commanding to Christian idealists than the doctrine of divine right could ever hope to seem. Greville, they knew, was but recalling Seneca's dictum that, "Right Reason is nothing else than a portion of the divine spirit set in a human body."[52] With him they were convinced that "All philosophers yeeld, (and it needeth no dispute) that the *Understanding* rectified still dictates to the *Will*, Optimum faciendum." The Ultimately Socratic principle of right reason, "the understanding rectified," or conscience—call it what you will—is the key to the conception of liberty in the Puritan Revolution. It is the key to the best thinking of the time in both religion and politics; just as the

[48] *CM* 5. 10. [49] *CM* 6. 158. [50] *Ibid.*

[51] Greville's *Episcopacie* is reprinted in William Haller's *Tracts on Liberty*, Vol. 2. References are to pp. 25 and 22.

[52] *Epistulae*, LXVI (Lodge's translation).

key to most of the less disciplined thought of the period is to be found in such popular, quasi-religious shibboleths as the Truth to which Milton appealed in *Areopagitica*, and which he seems, once or twice, there to idetify with Christ—the 'Christ-within' of the Fifth Monarchy men.[53] One thing is certain: in all of Milton's religious and political thinking—from his appeal to 'regenerate reason' in the anti-episcopal tracts, on down through the *Tenure*, the *Commonwealth* and *De Doctrina Christiana*, to almost his last word in the little tract *Of True Religion, Heresy, Schism, Toleration* in 1673—he was dominated by his confidence in the power of a half-divine Right Reason to find out the *Truth*.

The passage in all of Milton's writing where his faith in the final discoverability of Truth comes to climactic expression is the famous myth of Osiris in *Areopagitica*. It should be read in the light of many parallels in his own work and in that of his contemporaries, and it should also be read in the light of the two most telling and damaging criticisms which have been leveled at Milton by his many modern critics. With both of those criticisms in mind, let us read the passage against a very small segment of its literary background. The first of them is Mr. Ernest Boyd's objection (in *Literary Blasphemies*) that *Areopagitica* is quintessentially platitudinous and therefore insignificant; the second is Mr. Leavis's complaint (in *Revaluations*, pp. 58-9) that Milton is, "for purposes of the understanding, disastrously single-minded and simple-minded. . . . This defect," he says, "is a defect of imagination." The charge is brought against Milton as a poet, but it is worth checking against his use of the Osiris myth in his plea for liberty of conscience, for Mr. Leavis thinks that Milton's "inadequacy to myth" (in the structural sense in which the word is used in *Revaluations*) makes "the routine eulogy of his 'architectonic' power (in *Paradise Lost*) plainly a matter of mere inert convention." If our subject warranted such a digression, it would be a temptation to explore the structural significance for *Areopagitica* of this myth of Osiris which comes at its climax and is a symbol of its central theme of the search for Truth:

[53] The association of Milton with the Fifth Monarchy men was made by Pease in *The Leveller Movement* (New York, 1917), p. 154, and is explored by Barker in *Milton and the Puritan Dilemma*.

Truth indeed came once into the world with her divine Master, and was a perfect shape most glorious to look on: but when he ascended, and his apostles after him were laid asleep, then straight arose a wicked race of deceivers, who, as that story goes of the Egyptian Typhon with his conspirators, how they dealt with the good Osiris, took the virgin Truth, hewed her lovely form into a thousand pieces, and scattered them to the four winds. From that time ever since, the sad friends of Truth, such as durst appear, imitating the careful search that Isis made for the mangled body of Osiris, went up and down gathering up limb by limb still as they could find them. We have not yet found them all, lords and commons, nor ever shall do, till her Master's second coming, he shall bring together every joint and member, and shall mold them into an immortal feature of loveliness and perfection.[54]

The myth of Osiris, as Milton expected his readers as a matter of course to know, is found in Plutarch's *Moralia*. He expected them to be familiar also with some of the many interpretations of the myth [55] in just his sense by his contemporaries. He expected them also to be familiar with the kindred Renaissance conception of Truth as the Daughter of Time, the prevalence of which in literature and many of the pictorial arts has been studied for us by Professor Saxl.[56] The two ideas of truth are perhaps confused in Milton's condemnation in *Of Prelatical Episcopacy* of the search for Truth "among the verminous and polluted rags dropped overworn from the toiling shoulders of Time," to which he contrasted "the spotless and undecaying robe of Truth, the daughter, not of Time, but of Heaven, only bred up below here in Christian hearts, between two grave and holy nurses, the doctrine and discipline of the gospel." [57] Milton's experience of Presbyterian discipline within two years of the writing of these words was to confirm his notion that Time's shoulders dropped many verminous and polluted rags, but his faith in the quest for Truth never faltered—"Truth which," he said in *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*,[58] "among mortal men is always in her progress."

Of course, the progress was also a battle, and a winning one. When in *Areopagitica* Milton proposed to let Truth and False-

[54] *CM* 4. 337.

[55] Some of these are paralleled with this passage in my forthcoming edition of Selections from Milton's prose (Odyssey Press).

[56] In *Truth the Daughter of Time* (Publications of the Warburg Institute 4.).

[57] *CM* III. 91.

[58] *CM* 5. 57.

hood grapple, he was using the most platitudinous of all the images that had been consecrated in the Puritan struggle with the bishops. In countless Puritan pamphlets Truth strode invincibly into battle while the godly looked on with the serene faith that her strength was " sufficient for vanquishing the most artificial, sophisticall errour that ever was in the world." [59] The words are William Walwyn's in his *Power of Love*, a tract inspired far more by an enlightened visionary's prospect of a really democratic commonwealth to be established in England than by sectarian religious fervor. To the still more worldly-minded Henry Robinson, Truth's triumph in the politico-ecclesiastical battle seemed no less certain, and in *Liberty of Conscience* (1643) he asked, " . . . doe we suspect that errour shall vanquish truth? This is so vaine that no man will confesse so much; but for their full conviction if they were so conceited, let them take notice what *St. Paul* saith to the *Corinthians, We cannot do anything against the truth but for the truth.*" [60] Indeed in the Whitehall debates, when the Army leaders were talking and praying themselves into the resolution to show Charles I no mercy and to take the step which would inevitably turn England into a Republic, no figure of speech was commoner in their violent and whirling speeches than that of Truth as wrestling victoriously against Error and at the same time as somehow—both emotionally and philosophically—to be identified with the Christ for whose speedy second coming they prayed. When Ireton proposed a censorship on 'atheistical' publications and beliefs (not unlike that which Milton proposed in *Areopagitica*) Sprigge, supported by Lilburne, was prompt in condemning such lack of confidence in the ultimate victory of truth, and in " the breaking forth of him who is the Truth, the breaking forth of Christ, in the minds and spirits of men." [61] When Milton wrote *Areopagitica*, he knew that his public was conditioned to respond with either an enlighened, philosophical belief in Truth as symbolized by the Osiris myth, or with a fanatical faith in Truth the invincible champion; and he knew

[59] See Haller's *Tracts on Liberty* 2. 278. Compare William Dell on Truth's invincibility in a speech in the Army Debates preserved in Woodhouse's *Puritanism and Liberty*, p. 315.

[60] Henry Robinson, *Liberty of Conscience* (London, 1643), p. 59.

[61] *Puritanism and Liberty*, p. 144.

that both the belief and the faith were merged in many minds in the image of "her Master's second coming."

It is as easy for modern readers as it was for Milton's contemporaries to sentimentalize about the notion of Truth that found its classical expression in *Areopagitica*. It is closely bound up with the 'prophetic' side of the man in which Sir Herbert Grierson has interested us,[62] and it undoubtedly was related to his poetic gift. Indeed, Mr. G. Wilson Knight roundly identifies that poetic gift with Milton's passionate determination that "truth was to enter politics. This truth, (which Milton sometimes calls 'right reason')" he thinks,[63] "corresponds to 'faith' in St. Paul's epistles or the Church fathers and to 'imagination' as conceived by Coleridge and Shelley." As an antidote to Mr. Knight's impliedly sweeping and uncritical acceptance of Milton's political propaganda in the name of Truth it is worth while to remember that most of the political crimes of the Puritans were committed—perhaps quite sincerely—in the service of Truth. In our times the semanticists love to dissect the word, not greatly to the credit of its loudest devotees. With the aid of the Great Tom Fuller—speaking as he did in a sermon in honor of the anniversary of Charles's coronation in 1643—we may profitably pause to notice what a seventeenth century semanticist could do with the word and its abuse by the Puritans.

> "Know," he said to his doubtless sympathetic courtly audience, "then that the word *Truth* is subject to much *Homonymie*, and is taken in several senses, according to the opinions, or rather humours of those that use it. Aske the Anabaptist what is truth, and he will tell you, Truth is . . . that all goods should be common, that there should be no civill Magistrate, that there ought to be no warres but what they make themselves, for which they pretend inspiration. . . . Againe, Aske the Separatists what is Truth, and they will tell you, that the further from all ceremonies (though ancient and decent), the nearer to God. . . . Aske the Schismaticks of these times what is Truth, and they will bring in abundance of their own opinions, which I spare at this time to recite.[64]

Fuller, like all his party, was aware as no modern reader of

[62] Milton and Wordsworth, p. 47. [63] *Chariot of Wrath*, p. 74.

[64] "A Sermon Preached at the Collegiat Church of S. Peter in *Westminster*, on the 27 of March, being the day of His Majesties Inauguration, by Thomas Fuller, B. D. (London, 1643), p. 18.

Areopagitica can be of the anarchy and hypocrisy that lurked behind the idol of Truth, but his intolerance was the very thing that validated the faith of all the sects, and of liberals who were above the sectarian mêlée, in the divinity of Truth. Yet even Fuller, after declaring all the truths of the sectaries to be "flat falsities," professed his willingness to submit all differences of opinion to the fair debate for which the Puritans clamored. He had only one condition to lay down, but that was a betrayal of his own and his party's failure to comprehend the utopian energy of the "new Gospell" of the Puritans, which he insisted should not "be given as the Law, with thundering and lightning of Cannon, fire and sword." [65]

It is a nice question whether the kind of passion and thought which went into Milton's willingness to tolerate all kinds of heresies in *Areopagitica* can be regarded as evidence of imaginative power either in the political or in the Coleridgean sense. Perhaps most readers of *Ideology and Utopia* will grant the 'utopian' power of Milton's conception of truth (in Mannheim's sense of the word 'utopian'), as readers of Ortega y Gasset's *The Revolt of the Masses* may see a perfect correspondence between the successful imposition of Milton's notion of Truth as it shaped the emergent liberalism of the Puritan Revolution and Gasset's view that the "Imagination is the liberating power possessed by man. A people is capable of becoming a State in the degree to which it is able to imagine." [66] In a very vague and perhaps not highly significant sense there can be no doubt that, if not in the activity of the political imagination of the Puritans, then certainly in the shaping of the popular poetic imagination, the idea of the defeat of falsehood in open battle by truth was what Rebecca West has called "a potent image"; certainly it gave rise to many subsidiary images which were beautiful, if not very potent. For example, after a picture of embattled Truth in conflict with Error, Leonard Busher, in *Religions Peace*, changed the image and assured his audience that they should "understand that, errors being brought to the light of the word of God, [they would] vanish as darkness before the light of a torch." [67] And Robert

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 19.
[66] Ortega y Gasset, *The Revolt of the Masses* (London, 1932), p. 62.
[67] Quoted by Wolfe in *Milton in the Puritan Revolution*, p. 27. Cf. the close of

Greville, in a great passage on the Understanding as "a Ray of the Divine Nature, warming and enlivening the Creature, and conforming it to the likeness of the Creator," in the little essay called *The Nature of Truth*,[68] which is cited in *Areopagitica*, wrote finally of Truth in a style that suggests the invocation to light at the opening of the third book of *Paradise Lost*:

> For the Beauty of Truths character is, that she is a shadow, a resemblance of the first, the best forme; that she is light, the species, the sparkling of primitive *light*; that she is *life*, the sublimation of *light*, that she may reflect upon herself.[68]

Against the account of the diabolic parliament in Books One and Two of *Paradise Lost*, and in view of the following, contrasting debate in heaven, from which the Son of God emerges as leader of the states of heaven as Satan is leader of those of hell, it may not be forced to see some political intention in the seemingly purely metaphysical glories of the famous invocation to light at the beginning of Book III. Certainly it is as much a possibility as is Mr. Knight's interpretation of the Son in Book VI as a pattern of an English constitutional monarch. While feeling far less certain of any political significance in the invocation to light than Mr. Knight is of his view of the Son, we do have one very good reason for supposing that the Son is intended as a political symbol and a revolutionary one at his first appearance in the third book. If the suspicion of most readers that the diabolic parliament is a portrait of the Long Parliament can be confirmed, then the Son can hardly be regarded otherwise than a symbol of whatever it is that makes parliaments good. In that case it may be easy to see him as a symbol of a British constitutional king (though Milton's antipathy to kings and kingship from the days when he wrote his Commonplace Book to the time when he wrote the *Commonwealth* hardly encourages that opinion); or it may be easy to look upon him as a symbol of the Cromwellian leader, the god-commissioned superman, as Professor Liljegren is inclined ironically to do. Neither of these positions is easy to defend, but neither is it easy to disbelieve that Milton's treatment of his infernal

the Humble Petition of 1641: "That which is erroneous will in time appeare, and the professors of it will bee ashamed, and it will perish and wither as a flower, vanish as smoke, and pass as a shadow." (Quoted by Wolfe on p. 70.)

[68] *The Nature of Truth* (1641), pp. 3-4.

and heavenly parliaments was in some sense an attempt to solve the political and moral problem of the failure of the Long Parliament, which he dissected so severely in *The History of Britain*.

If the Son of God in the third book of *Paradise Lost* has any political significance, it is simply as the force of good and effective leadership without which parliaments are worse than helpless. Milton's impatience with the impotence of the Long Parliament to act rightly and independently on questions like the freedom of the press, the divorce law, and the great problem of disposing of the King, must have given him many moments when his disgust with representative governments was as great as Lenin's with the Russian Douma. As a young man at the beginning of his political career, writing his anti-episcopal tracts, Milton could sincerely describe Parliament as "so much united excellence, (met) in one globe of brightness and efficacy, . . . encountering the dazzled resistance of tyranny." [69] In *Of Reformation in England* [70] he wrote of "the indiminishable majesty of our highest court, the law-giving and sacred parliament." That was "our time of parliament, the very jubilee and resurrection of the state." [71] Perhaps there was no fundamental loss of faith in connection with Parliament's neglect of the divorce pamphlets and *Areopagitica*; but when, after the execution of Charles, he declared that "the parliament is above all positive law, whether civil or common," [72] and said that the "Law of England" was "but the reason of Parliament," [73] he was beginning to be aware of what Lenin was to call the 'disease of parliamentarism.' He had, with reason, lost faith in the power of Parliament to act without the spur of Cromwell's will. Bitter experience was teaching him the need of strong leadership in representative government, and the wonder is that at no time does he seem to have succumbed to the remedy of the single, strong leader.[74] At the fall of the Commonwealth in

[69] *CM* 3. 337.
[70] *CM* 3. 58.
[71] *CM* 3. 127.
[72] *CM* 5. 115.
[73] *CM* 5. 83.

[74] In "The Theory of the Mixed State and the Development of Milton's Political Thought" (*PMLA* 57 [1942]. 721-2), Professor Z. S. Fink acknowledges that for a time Milton believed in . . . divinely appointed . . . leaders" who were law givers like Lycurgus and Solon and, presumably, Cromwell. In *A Ready and Easy Way*, however, Milton abandoned that faith.

1660, when he was writing his *Ready and Easy Way* to establish a better one, his contempt for government by " a single person " was uncompromising. Even the sonnet to Cromwell in 1652 accepts him only as the champion of truth who is to save England, if he proves worthy, from foes who were " Threatening to bind our souls with secular chains." Significantly, in his eulogy in *The Second Defence*, he is presented only as one of the soldiers whom England has used in her own liberation, and his greatest distinction is that he is a man who has mastered the passions which beset the soul. And when in 1660 final defe . for the Commonwealth came, Milton proved his fidelity to the parliamentary principle by grappling in *The Ready and Easy Way* with the ' disease of parliamentarism ' and trying to devise means to prevent the Grand Council which he proposed should govern the realm from being one of the " mere ' talking shops ' " that Lenin condemned in modern Europe. Like Lenin, he thought that a Parliament should be " a working corporation, legislative and executive at the same time," [75] and it is perhaps the best claim of both men to have been honest and clear-headed leaders in their respective revolutions that they both tried to make parliaments responsive to strong leadership and capable of producing it. And this is true even though Lenin's notion, which looked forward to the Russian soviets, had as little to do with Milton's Grand Council as it did with the heavenly parliament in the third book of *Paradise Lost*.

3

To compare Milton with Lenin in any respect is to invite a challenge of his right to rank at all as a revolutionist in the modern democratic and economic sense. That he was no democrat in the modern sense needs no demonstration. The " popular assembly of upward of a thousand " which he provided for in *A Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth*, as Professor Fink has shown,[76] however, had a genuine, though rather negative and contemptible part to play in Milton's theory of state sovereignty as best if ' mixed ' and unevenly divided among "magisterial, aristocratic and demo-

[75] Nikolai Lenin, *The State and Revolution* (New York, 1929), p. 153.
[76] *PMLA* 67. 716.

cratic elements." It is the uncompromisingly aristocratic cast of Milton's political thinking that is hard for the modern world to accept. We forget how radically consistent his aristocratic thinking was, and what a social and economic revolution it entailed. We forget how bitterly the abolition of the House of Lords under the Cromwellian Commonwealth had been resented, and what an economic upheaval was involved in the nationalization of the estates of the royalist nobles. No one supported the abolition of the House of Lords more cordially than did Milton, and no one deplored the dishonest resale of what might have largely remained public land by Parliament to the favored grandees of the Parliamentary Party more sincerely than he did. The extent of the economic revolution under the Protectorate is amusingly exploited in the reply to Milton's *Ready and Easy Way* by George Starkey, *The Dignity of Kingship Asserted*.[77] The whole country, and especially the gentry and the merchant classes, are represented as having been robbed by the Rump's expropriations of nobility and churchmen, and by its "monstrous taxes, (which they extorted to maintain their *Janisaries* the *Apostate Souldiers* by whose *mutiny* and *Rebellion* they were first *constituted*)."[78]

Yet what interested Milton in the attack on the hereditary nobility in the Puritan Revolution, it is plain, was the emergence of the principle that was to play so large a part in the French Revolution—the principle that honor should go to men of talent rather than to men of family. If rank and property could be cleared of snobbery, Milton had no quarrel with the landed families. That much seems clear from his refusal in the *Way* to accept the principle of the periodic return of all the land in the realm to small or comparatively small holders, which Harrington had made a basic part of his constitution in his *Oceana*. In spite of Harrington's weighty authority for the principle in the laws of Moses and the example of the agrarian proposals of the Gracchi in republican Rome, Milton said that, if he could be assured that in his commonwealth there would be no temporal or spiritual lords, he was confident that no individual or group could "attain to such wealth or vast pos-

[77] *The Dignity of Kingship Asserted*, edited for the Facsimile Text Society by W. R. Parker (New York, 1941).

[78] *Ibid.*, p. 148.

sessions as will need the hedge of an agrarian law." Such laws, he added, had never been successful, " but the cause rather of sedition, save only where it began seasonably with first possession." [79] Milton's commonwealth would hardly have been levelled down economically any more than the England in which he actually lived. If he shared in the middle-class hatred of a privileged nobility which Professor Brinton says in *The Anatomy of Revolution* [80] is a part of every revolutionary movement, it was less because he was envious of the nobles, as Dr. Johnson said that he was, than because, as George Starkey said,[81] he believed that a commonwealth was the best kind of government to secure " *Civil Freedome*, which consists in Civil Rights and the advancement of every person according to his *merit*."

Probably none of Milton's twentieth-century readers outside of Germany will dislike him a whit for being guilty of an interest in civil rights. His interest in the mutual claims of society and the meritorious individual smack too much of ' rugged individualism ' and the Aristotelian " concept of natural slavery and the Christian doctrine of sin," [82] however, to be acceptable to Mr. Don Wolfe. Because " in *Paradise Lost*, as in the pamphlets, Milton identified sin with political ignorance," [83] Mr. Wolfe regrets the severity of Milton's verdict on his countrymen for throwing away (or seeming to throw away) the hard-won liberties that were sacrificed to recall Charles II in 1660. By implication, he would disapprove of the characteristic entries under the heading of *Libertas* in the Commonplace Book which declare that nations get the governments that they deserve, that Brutus and Cassius erred in thinking that Rome was capable of liberty,[84] and that liberty once lost is irrecoverable.[85] He looks askance at the psychology which led Milton to preach the subjection of passion to reason in some of the speeches of Michael and Raphael in *Paradise Lost*, and at the extension of that psychology into the political principle of the rule of good

[79] *CM* 6. 134.
[80] Pp. 72 and 286-7.
[81] *Dignity of Kingship*, p. 25.
[82] *Milton in the Puritan Revolution*, p. 346.
[83] *Ibid.*, p. 347.
[84] *CM* 18. 163.
[85] *CM* 18. 193-4.

men. The Christ of *Paradise Regained*, who says that God and Nature approve

> When he who rules is worthiest, and excells
> Them whom he governs,

smacks to Mr. Wolfe of the tyrant that Professor Liljegren saw in the Christ of *Paradise Lost*, and in "the stern judgments" of that poem he sees "the boundless charity of the Christ, glimpsed by . . . Saltmarsh and Walwyn and Roger Williams (fluttering) helplessly in the offing."[86] Altogether, Mr. Wolfe finds that "Milton's portrayal of Christ . . . shows his lack of sympathy with the full measure of love and forgiveness that the extreme Puritan revolutionists emphasized in their characterizations."[87] The upshot is that for Mr. Wolfe the peak of Milton's effectiveness as a political thinker is the "revolutionary fervor that would open all creeds to pitiless criticism" in *Areopagitica*, and "the democratic arguments of *The Tenure* and *The Defence*."[88]

Probably most of Mr. Wolfe's readers will concur with him in rating *Areopagitica* and *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* above *The Ready and Easy Way to establish a Free Commonwealth*. Doubtless Milton would not agree with him. In the equal stress upon the evils of royal tyranny and mob rule in the *Way* he spoke out of his experience of the Puritan Revolution. From his silence about the extremely liberal humanitarian and theological views of men like Walwyn, Williams, and Winstanley it is hardly fair to conclude that he had a hard heart. Winstanley's *Law of Freedom*, the communistic manifesto of the Diggers of St. George's hill in February, 1652, with its Marxian conviction that wealth is produced only by labor, its annual turnover of all public offices, its principle of exchange by barter, and above all with its proposal of free and technical education for everyone, seems to anticipate the economic 'dialectic' of Marx and his followers. No one can deny the interest of Winstanley's communistic conception of a commonwealth for his own time as well as for ours.[89] Yet in general it

[86] *Milton in the Puritan Revolution*, pp. 346 and 349.
[87] *Ibid.*, p. 350.
[88] *Ibid.*, p. 351.
[89] Cf. Professor Sabine's Introduction to his edition of *The Works of Winstanley*, pp. 54-8.

is true, as Professor Jordan believes, that "the thought of the incendiary political groups—the Fifth Monarchy men, the Levellers, the Diggers, and the more violent republicans—was quite as divorced from the economic realities of the age as it was from the political necessities of the period. Moreover, the economic and social thinking of the more radical sectaries, animated as it was by the vision of the Kingdom of God on earth, was in most instances so detached from the trend of English development as to be without great significance for the period."[90] Certainly there was some radically democratic interpretation of the law of nature by men like Rainborough in the Army debates, but in general "even the Levellers were against interference with property,"[91] and men like Ireton, who defended property rights, carried the argument. Mr. Jordan points out that the most unsparing attacks on the Levellers' leaders were made by one of the most effective political writers of the Revolution, Henry Parker,[92] and it is surely true that in his attack on John Lilburne, Parker proclaimed the principle that "liberty cannot be permitted to degenerate into anarchy"[93] with far greater controversial bitterness than Milton ever showed.

Argument of this kind, however, will never reconcile Mr. Wolfe and those of his way of thinking to Milton as a political thinker in the Puritan Revolution. They are hardly likely to be impressed by even the most liberal and far-seeing of his political views, like his recommendation of strong local governments with independent courts and good schools throughout England.[94] Nor are they to be silenced by M. Saurat's condescending warning not to "forget too easily that Milton was not only a critic of kings and tyrants," or by his approval of Milton's "vital observations on the essential principles on which democracies should be worked." Mr. Wolfe is not likely to agree with M. Saurat that the practice of "explaining every-

[90] *Men of Substance*, pp. 203-4.

[91] Margaret James in *Social Problems and Policy during the Puritan Revolution* (London, 1930), p. 119.

[92] *Men of Substance*, p. 156.

[93] *Ibid.*, p. 176.

[94] The significance of this suggestion and of Milton's support for it from the value of local institutions in the Dutch struggle for liberty, becomes clear in the light of Starkey's violent reply in *The Dignity of Kingship*, pp. 107-9.

thing by economic factors " is a " craze," or that the " older . . . method of blaming and somewhat regulating human nature . . . in Milton's pamphlets " [95] is the right way to face either political or ethical problems.

Perhaps those problems need not be faced before justice is done to Milton as a political thinker. Perhaps we may understand him best if, like Mr. Barker, we regard him as an idealist who thought that " the function of the revolution was to achieve civil liberty through the inward laws of true religion," [96] and if we study his political pamphlets as " the not altogether successful attempt of an idealist . . . to read in the chaotic events of the revoltuion a pattern which would justify both the ways of God and men." [97] The effort to account for his faith in private reason and natural law as capable of finding the way to the City of God has a more than literary-historical value. It is not merely a matter of showing that his political thought in both his poetry and prose was essentially Platonic. It is a matter of finding where to place him in the revolutionary process of the past four centuries. His part in the Puritan revolution is a landmark in the transition from the religious culture of the Middle Ages to the materialistic world of today. In that movement he appears not exactly as a Platonist, but as an 'idealist' in the sense that Professor Sorokin regards [98] Plato as an idealist whose development was governed by an historical principle which makes the appearance of idealistic thought inevitable whenever religious civilizations begin to move toward a materialistic or " sensate " culture. Although Milton's political idealism involved faith in the City of God, it was not reactionary, for it not only made the individual free; it made his salvation and that that of society rest upon his use of his critical faculties.

[95] Denis Saurat in a review of the Columbia Milton, Vol. 5 to 10, in *The Review of English Studies* 10. 230.

[96] *Milton and the Puritan Dilemma*, p. 192.

[97] *Ibid.*, p. 213.

[98] The use made of Platonic concepts and of Aristotle's theory of kingship and tyranny in *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* may be recognized as one of the " Idealistic motives " by which Professor Sorokin explains " the theories of Plato " and " Aristotle's three good forms of government (monarchy, aristocracy, and polity) in contradistinction to the three wrong or bad forms of government and leadership, where the Idealistic values are absent (tyranny, oligarchy, and mob rule)." *Social and Cultural Dynamics* 3 (1937). 145-6.

Today it can hardly be admired or understood because it was more concerned with social discipline than it was with the social justice of humanitarian democracy. Milton's prime concern was with the perfection of the state and of the individual. That is why, in his first burst of revolutionary writing, in the anti-episcopal tracts, he was more of a reformer than a revolutionist; and that is why, as he explored what Christian liberty meant to him in the divorce tracts, *Areopagitica*, the *Tenure* and the later political pamphlets, he became more and more of a radical idealist—a revolutionist without a party and with only the faith of the champion of a lost cause in revolution itself.

University of Wisconsin.

THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF THE SECTION ON IRELAND IN CAMDEN'S *BRITANNIA*

By RUDOLF B. GOTTFRIED

The almost universal reverence with which William Camden was regarded by his contemporaries needs hardly to be mentioned among students of his period. The praises of Spenser and Ben Jonson are well known; the commendatory verses of his fellow antiquarians, written for the most part in Greek and Latin, adorn his works; his funeral was "honored (besides much other goode and choice companie) with the presence" of Lord Keeper Williams, Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, and Bishop William Laud.[1] But the respect, not to say the extreme admiration, which Camden generally inspired confronts us with the obvious question: what qualities in his work won him the respect of minds as unlike as these? What did his whole age, consciously or unconsciously, find to admire in him? From the point of view of a modern reader, Camden is less theoretical, less interested in ideas than any subsequent historian of equal fame: how did a compiler of mere annals and antiquities become the outstanding scholar of his time?

If we confine ourselves to the *Britannia*, the most popular of Camden's works, there is an obvious answer: he was not afraid to choose a subject of outstanding interest to Elizabethans of the most diverse interests. For Spenser the national antiquities were a source of rapturous reflection. For the government the study of British history provided themes which could be turned to well calculated political uses; and it is significant that the first four editions of the *Britannia* were dedicated to Burghley, the most influential member of Elizabeth's government. At the same time, the geographical organization of his material, for which Camden had found a model in earlier English writers as well as Pausanias, served to popularize the *Britannia* in every hamlet which it mentioned. Both national and local patriotism were involved in its success.

[1] *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. Norman Egbert McClure (Philadelphia, 1939), 2. 527.

But the obvious popularity of Camden's subject may easily be overemphasized at the expense of his other qualities, especially, I think, at the expense of his regard for historical truth. In an age which was not critical in ascertaining facts Camden went to the greatest trouble to secure the most recent information, and he usually, if not always, gave an unbiased report of what he had discovered. English historians, to take only one example, commonly held that the British race owed its name and its separate existence to Brutus, the descendant of Aeneas; in spite of, or perhaps because of foreign attacks on this theory Elizabethan writers continued to defend it as a point of national honor; yet Camden conspicuously questions the truth of the Brutus legend.[2] On this important issue, in other words, his patriotism did not defeat his scholarship. And it is significant that, while the patriotic subject of the *Britannia* was the basis of its popularity, Camden was likewise respected as an unusually reliable scholar: "What name, what skill, what faith hast thou in things!" writes Jonson, and another contemporary calls Camden "*veritatis Antistes*," high priest of truth.[3] His regard for truth, in fact, gives a peculiar importance to the wide influence he exerted on an age generally far less critical of truth than he.

The painstaking honesty of Camden's scholarship may eventually be demonstrated by an intensive study of the whole *Britannia*; but it is possible to learn something about his scholarship from a study of a single section of the work, a section which, while appealing only in an indirect way to Elizabethan patriotism, clarifies his methods as an historian and a geographer. It may be helpful, I believe, to summarize the evidence supplied by the early texts of the *Britannia* in that portion of it which is devoted to Ireland.

Camden's interest in Ireland had probably begun some time before he wrote on the subject, and it continued down to the end of his life. At Westminster School he converted several Irish scholars to Protestantism; at some date, probably after

[2] *Britannia*, ed. 1590, pp. 6-8.

[3] Jonson, epigram no. 14; Camden's *Annales* (London, 1615-1627), verses by Raphael Thorius under portrait facing title page.

the suppression of Tyrone's Rebellion, he composed a Latin poem, in sixty-four hexameter lines, describing Ireland as a newly pacified country; and during his last years he corresponded with a number of Dublin antiquaries.[4] These details suggest that drawing up an account of Ireland must have been more than a perfunctory, ungrateful task for him; but the extent of his interest is placed beyond doubt by a comparison of the six editions of the Latin *Britannia* published during his lifetime.

The first, that of 1586, devotes some thirty-five pages to a crowded description of the seas around Ireland, of its four provinces, and of the customs of its people. The edition of 1587 corrects certain mistakes and adds a fair amount of new material. This text is republished, with only a few changes, in 1590; in 1594, however, considerable additions are made for a second time. In 1600 the evidences of reworking are slighter again. But the edition of 1607, the last for which Camden was directly responsible, undergoes a transformation so drastic that we are practically faced with another work.[5] Thus the account of Ireland is most thoroughly revised in the second, fourth, and sixth—particularly the sixth—editions. The amount of revision in each case, moreover, is not proportionate to the number of years since a previous edition; therefore, it seems probable that Camden made a more deliberate effort to improve the second and fourth editions than to improve the third and fifth; the sixth, we can be sure, was rewritten in what he intended to be a definitive form.[6]

The changes introduced in 1587, only a year after the first edition, reveal a mind which scrupulously questioned details. Certain obvious mistakes are corrected: in the original text, for example, the length of Ireland had been given as "DCCC" miles; this figure is now reduced to "CCCC."[7] But Camden, it may well be evidence that he was already interested in heraldry, also corrects the form and the spelling of names:

[4] *Epistolae*, ed. Thomas Smith (London, 1691), Part 1, p. 247; Part 2, pp. 100-101; Part 1, pp. 76 ff., 86, 218, 235-239, 257, 284.

[5] Camden, of course, oversaw Philemon Holland's English translation of the *Britannia* (London, 1610).

[6] On Camden's changes in general, see Edmund Gibson's English edition of the *Britannia* (London, 1695), sig. b2^{v}.

[7] 1586, p. 492; 1587, p. 566.

Richard Strongbow, although generally known by that nickname and as Earl of Strigul, becomes Earl of Pembroke in the version of 1587; Humphrey "Boonensis" becomes "Bohunensis."[8] Changes made for the sake of style or a closer approximation to classical usage are few;[9] the emphasis lies rather on giving information which is accurate and up-to-date. To use only one illustration: in 1586 Camden refers to the *eleventh* Earl of Kildare as living, although that nobleman had actually died on 16 November, 1585; in the text of 1587 *eleventh* is corrected to read *twelfth*.[10]

But far more numerous than the corrections are the passages which were added to the second edition. Under each province Camden now includes a list of counties.[11] Dublin, he explains, was called "Duflin" by the Saxons, and he adds a brief account of the early magistrates of the city.[12] Waterford, Howth, and Athlone all receive new notice.[13] He inserts the etymology *St. Mary-wick* for *Smerwick*, perhaps borrowing it from the 1586 edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles*.[14] Along with much else that is included for the first time, he tells us that water stands in marshes on the tops of Irish mountains; that either turf or English coal rather than wood is burned around Dublin; that, according to dependable Irish sources, some of the inhabitants of Ormond are annually turned into wolves; that the island abounds in cattle and sheep, but that all the animals living there, except the greyhounds, are smaller than the same species in England; that the weather causes many colds, for which Irish whiskey is an excellent remedy; that the inhabitants, in spite of what Giraldus Cambrensis says to the contrary, suffer from fevers; and that the climate, just as in England, does not allow grapes to reach maturity.[15] He

[8] 1586, pp. 496, 497, 502; 1587, pp. 572, 574, 580. See also the transformation of "Genuillos" (1586, p. 509) into "Ienuillos" (1587, p. 588), into "Ieneuillos" (1600, p. 777), into "Geneuillos" (1607, p. 754).

[9] See "corui oculos" (1586, p. 503); "cornicis oculos" (1587, p. 581), the regular form of the Latin proverb.

[10] 1586, p. 507; 1587, p. 585.

[11] 1587, pp. 576, 580, 589, 592.

[12] 1587, p. 585.

[13] 1587, pp. 580, 586, 588.

[14] Vol. II, "The Supplie of the Irish Chronicles," p. 154; *Britannia*, 1587, p. 577.

[15] 1587, pp. 567, 585, 581, 567.

goes on to quote a description of Ireland, in seventeen Latin hexameters, by Adrian Junius.[16]

Several observations, which I shall discuss later, are likewise added to the section on native customs at the end of the historical and geographical account; but to the body of that account a little is added which betrays Camden's feelings about the mere Irish. At two places he inserts disparaging references to the rebellion under the late Earl of Desmond; in another passage he observes that if the natives of Connaught live from hand to mouth, it is because they prefer idleness to labor.[17] To prove that the kings of England had never acknowledged the popes as overlords of Ireland the arguments of Sir Thomas More are now included; but it is significant that More himself was a Catholic and that his reasoning on this point had already been used by Edmund Campion, a Catholic historian.[18] Furthermore, Camden now adds another long passage in praise of the early monasteries.[19] The *Britannia* of 1587, then, gives less evidence of Anti-Catholic than of anti-Irish feeling. But most of the changes, in any case, reveal that Camden was striving to bring together as much accurate information as was available on Ireland.

During the three years following 1587, however, Ireland can hardly have occupied much of his attention. The *Britannia* of 1590 contains, in its Irish section, only two new passages of any importance, both centered on short quotations from the Late Latin poet Festus Avienus. One of these supports Camden's belief that the ancient inhabitants of Ireland were British.[20] The other supplies evidence for translating *Banno*, the bardic name for Ireland, as *Sacred*.[21] This passage, with its marginalium "*Sacra Insula*," is of interest to students of Spenser since he recollects it in his *View of the Present State of Ireland*.[22] The *View* was written in 1596, and before 1596 the only editions of the *Britannia* which contain the reference to

[16] 1587, p. 568.
[17] 1587, pp. 576, 579, 589.
[18] *The Historie of Ireland* (Dublin, 1633), p. 75; *Britannia*, 1587, p. 573; further addition in 1607, p. 731.
[19] 1587, p. 571.
[20] 1590, p. 682.
[21] 1590, p. 678.
[22] *View*, ed. W. L. Renwick (London, 1934), p. 120; F. F. Covington, Jr., "Spenser's Use of Irish History in the *Veue of the Present State of Ireland*," *University of Texas Bulletin*, Studies in English 4 (1924), 33-34.

"*Sacra Insula*" are those of 1590 and 1594; therefore, in writing the *View*, Spenser must have used either one or the other of these texts.

When we turn to the changes made in the *Britannia* of 1594, we find that the development which began in 1587 and lapsed in 1590 is now resumed; Camden again increases and corrects his knowledge of Ireland. The corrections, to be sure, are few and almost too minute for illustration: the name of the rebel Earl of Desmond is emended from *James* to *Gerald*; "*Castelenot*" and "*Mac Conlan*" become respectively "*Castelcnok*" and "*Mac Coghlan.*"[23] But the very minuteness of such changes is the best evidence of Camden's thoroughness, and with them go far more frequent and extensive additions.

For the first time he rounds out his angular style by adding whole sentences of a purely rhetorical nature. The description of Ireland opens with the new statement: "I have run, rather than wandered, through all Britain, namely those two flourishing kingdoms of England and Scotland; but since it is necessary for me to cross the water in order to reach Ireland and the other islands, I hope that I shall not unduly lengthen my journey if I say a few words on the British Ocean first of all."[24] Rhetorical additions, however, are subordinated to additions of fact. The wind Caurus, we are now told, arises near Ireland, as Caesar and Scaliger say, although Lucan writes otherwise; and several learned quotations are inserted in a passage concerning the pearls found in the British Ocean.[25] Camden brings his description of Dublin up to date by referring to Trinity College, which had been founded only three years earlier.[26] On the other hand, his researches have gone back into the obscurities of native Irish history: among the causes of the Anglo-Norman invasion in the twelfth century he now includes the rape of the wife of O'Rourk, King of Meath; and he adds a short account of how the O'Moores, O'Tooles, and O'Byrnes usurped parts of Leinster in the reign of Edward the Second.[27] But the most extensive group of additions reveals a new familiarity with the histories of the Anglo-Irish nobility. Camden mentions, among

[23] 1590, pp. 690, 700, 701; 1594, pp. 653, 662, 663.
[24] 1594, p. 639.
[25] 1594, p. 640.
[26] 1594, p. 661.
[27] 1594, pp. 649, 658.

others, the Flemings of Slane, the Tyrells of Castleknock, the Mesets of Delvin; he describes how Sir John Bermingham was created Earl of Louth for defeating Edward Bruce in 1317; and in several passage he traces the Lacy family of Ulster and, at even greater length, the descendants of Richard Strongbow, Earl of Pembroke.[28] This genealogical development, which comes three years before Camden's preferment to the College of Heralds, is the most striking change in the text of 1594.

The changes made in the *Britannia* of 1600 are scattered and unimportant by comparison. The first of them is perhaps the most interesting: the dedication to Sir Edward Hoby which had headed the section on Ireland in the previous four editions is now omitted. Although Hoby was still alive in 1600, the omission was hardly intended to be a slight. In the previous editions the whole of the *Britannia* had been dedicated to Burghley, who was Hoby's uncle; Burghley had died in 1598, and in 1600 Elizabeth became the patron of the work; therefore, since the pendant dedication to Burghley's nephew was no longer suitable, Camden omitted it. At the same time he included a rude map of ancient Ireland, early evidence of the tendency to make the *Britannia* into a kind of atlas.[29] The only other addition of significance is a sentence referring to the kingdom of Cork and the present inheritor of that region, Sir George Carew, who had been a fellow student of Camden's at Pembroke College, Oxford, and for whose assistance in supplying information on Ireland he was later to express his gratitude.[30] A few corrections should also be mentioned because they reveal an invariable desire for accuracy: the first Earl of Essex was Marshall of Ireland, not merely of Ulster; the Butlers were actually relatives of Thomas à Becket, not merely reported to be such.[31] But these changes, if taken together, do not reveal that Camden made any large effort to revise the text of 1600.

The contrast presented by the edition of 1607 is startling. At a glance it can be seen that the section on Ireland has been tremendously increased in length. In the original edition of

[28] 1594, pp. 659, 661-662, 663, 667, 663-664, 671, 650, 658, 660-661.
[29] 1600, "Hibernia Antiqva," opposite p. 755.
[30] 1600, p. 768; 1607, pp. 739-740. *Epistolae*, p. iv.
[31] 1590, pp. 711, 694; 1600, pp. 785, 770.

1586 it fills some 35 small pages; in the edition of 1600 it fills what is equivalent at most to 50 pages of the same size; in the edition of 1607 it fills 115 folio pages. Nor is it difficult to see where much of this final increase occurs. The small map of the 1600 text is replaced by a two-page map of contemporary Ireland; and Camden adds two long sections which are entirely new, an account of Tyrone's late rebellion, as well as of the origin of the O'Neills, and the text of two chronicles covering Irish history from 1162 to 1421.[32] Less conspicuously he inserts, along with a complete list of the counties and bishoprics of Ireland, a new description of her form of government.[33]

But the thoroughness of the revision appears not so much in the large separate units which are entirely new as in the extension and development of old material. In the first five editions the description of Ireland is divided according to provinces; in the sixth it is further subdivided according to counties. Not only does this improvement necessitate a considerable reorganization, but Camden makes other improvements in the order of details; single sentences from the previous texts may, therefore, turn up in the most unexpected places. And at the same time the old material is intermingled with at least twice as much new material as had been added in all four of the previous editions. The number and complexity of the changes defy any thorough description.

Certain tendencies, however, may be briefly indicated. There are, for example, a few changes which seem to have been made out of deference to the new monarch of both England and Scotland: at the very beginning of the Irish section " Britannia nostra " becomes " Britannia," " nobis Anglis " simply " Anglis "; and the name of James Cheyne, a Scotch Catholic whose authority had been cited in earlier editions, is now discreetly omitted.[34] The colonizing policy of the new reign probably motivates a long insertion describing the fertility of the country, while several sharp reflections are also added on the Irish character.[35] But these tendentious passages, it is sig-

[32] 1607, " Hiberniae," pp. 724-725 (a map which, though large, is inaccurate; *e. g.*, see " Bolerant " for Buttevant); pp. 774-787, 794-836.

[33] 1607, pp. 733-736.

[34] 1590, pp. 675, 677; 1607, pp. 720, 726. The whole *Britannia* is dedicated to King James in 1607.

[35] 1607, pp. 773, 742, 746, 749, 754.

nificant of Camden's mind and method, are completely overshadowed by his endeavor to supply as much correct information as possible. Every kind of evidence which the previous editions had used is greatly increased. Among the ancients he cites additional matter from Libanius, St. Ambrose, Solinus, Pliny, Bede, Tertullian, Tacitus, Mela, Martian, Strabo, Einhard, Silius Italicus, and Horace; at greater length he reconsiders his former identifications of the tribes and places named by Ptolemy.[36] His knowledge of Irish geography has been expanded from contemporary sources also, perhaps from the more accurate maps which were beginning to appear at this time: he again reduces his estimate of Ireland's dimensions, from 400 by 200 to 300 by 120 miles; and it is interesting that he chiefly improves the description of Ulster and northern Connaught, regions of which cartographers had just begun to give a recognizable picture.[37] He has increased his information about every past period of Irish history: the Milesian, the Roman, the Early Christian, the Danish, the Norman, the Tudor; and for his facts he now mentions such sources as a manuscript belonging to the Baron of Howth, Roger of Hoveden, and the close rolls for the reign of King John.[38] At the same time he brings the historical account up to date by new references to Sir Henry Sidney, Thomas Stuckley, Sir John Perrot, Sir William FitzWilliam, Colonel Henry Dowcra, and Roderic O'Donell, whom King James had recently created Earl of Tirconell in succession to his rebellious brother.[39] Camden, moreover, adds not only the names of the chief English families settled in each county but more of the genealogical material which had distinguished the edition of 1594 from those which preceded it.[40]

The number and variety of all the changes made in the text of 1607 can only be suggested; but in the case of a few passages it is possible, as well as worthwhile, to take a more detailed

[36] 1607, pp. 720, 721, 722, 726, 727, 731, 755-756, 736, 737, 738, 744, 748, 759.

[37] 1590, pp. 679, 702, 703, 704, 708, 709, 710; 1607, pp. 727, 755, 757, 770, 763, 771.

[38] 1607, pp. 728, 729, 730, 766, 767, 750, 731, 732, 761.

[39] 1607, pp. 760, 768, 752, 760, 762, 764, 772.

[40] See particularly 1607, pp. 743 (the Butlers), 772-773 (the Lacys and Burkes), 747 (the Earls of Kildare), 736-738 (the Earls of Desmond).

view of Camden's methods. His long account of Tyrone's Rebellion, for example, opens with the statement that he has written it in fulfillment of a promise made to a good friend who is now dead; we know that in February, 1606, his friend, the French historian Jacques Auguste De Thou, who did not die until 1617, had asked him for just such an account; it is clear, in any case, that at this point a personal factor played a part in the development of the *Britannia*.[41] The prompting of another scholar, James Ussher, who was later to be the outstanding figure of the English Church in Ireland, led Camden to include the long mediaeval chronicle which now goes by the name of Christopher Pembridge.[42] But Ussher assisted Camden far more directly. On 30 October, 1606, he writes to him from Dublin:

> Sir,
>
> The 10th of October I received your Letter, which brought unto me the welcom news of your pains lately taken in adorning this poor Country [*i. e.*, Ireland]. I am sorry I understood no sooner of your purpose: but seeing the forwardness of your Press is such, as cannot afford any longer time of deliberation, I will endeavor to give some slender satisfaction unto those points, which you have propounded.[43]

In the long letter which follows he generously gives much information which Camden later wove into the text of 1607. In one case Ussher corrects a mistake which his own uncle, Richard Stanihurst, had made in Holinshed's *Chronicles*.[44] The most important passage of his letter, however, is a two-page Latin description of Dublin, "the City of mine own birth," written because, as he remarks, "you desire to have a Topographical description thereof set down in mine own words."[45] In the *Britannia* Camden prints the entire passage almost *verbatim*, making only minor stylistic changes and a few additions of fact; he concludes, "Most of these observations on Dublin I acknowledge that I owe to the diligence and learning of James Ussher, Chancellor of St. Patrick's Cathedral, whose judgment and manifold erudition far surpass his years."[46] The

[41] 1607, p. 774; *Epistolae*, Part 1, pp. 68-69.
[42] *Epistolae*, Part 1, p. 78; *Britannia*, 1607, pp. 794-832. See Robert Dunlop's article on Pembridge in *DNB*.
[43] *Epistolae*, Part 1, p. 76.
[44] *Epistolae*, Part 1, p. 82.
[45] *Epistolae*, Part 1, pp. 80-82.
[46] 1607, pp. 751-752.

acknowledgment, although it suggests a smaller debt than quotation marks would have betrayed, is hardly ungenerous for the Renaissance; by 1607 the *Britannia* already confesses itself to be the work of more than one author.

Thus far I have endeavored to illustrate the steps in the development of the *Britannia* by citing the evidence which the early texts of the portion devoted to Ireland supply. This portion of the book, if the changes made in each of the first six editions are considered in turn, reveals the painstaking thoroughness of Camden's scholarship, and reveals it most fully in the editions of 1587, of 1594, and of 1607. From an analysis of each edition separately considered it is convenient to turn aside, however, in order to discuss one last, not unimportant point.

All of the six earliest editions contain a long, connected description of the ancient and modern customs of the Irish.[47] This description receives a title of its own in 1594; certain passages are added to it in 1587 and 1607; but its essential features remain unchanged throughout all the texts. It opens with three quotations from classical writers who portray the barbarity of the ancient Irish; the body of it is a valuable seven-page account of the Irish in the sixteenth century. We are told how they put their children out to foster; how they delight in idleness and thievery; how they blaspheme and take their oaths; how they easily make and easily dissolve their marriages; how they associate many superstitions with animals, particularly with the horse; how they shout in battle; and how their women keen for the dead, whose souls they imagine to have gone to dwell among their mythological heroes. The picture as a whole is not an engaging one nor do later additions soften its sharp outlines. In 1587, to be sure, it is added that the Irish delight in music; but we are also told that murderers and incendiaries boast, "Christ will not allow His blood to have been shed in vain for me," and that when an Irish priest dies, his daughters are reduced to beggary or prostitution.[48] In 1607 new material is inserted on native clothes and the custom of scattering salt in fields which are to be sowed, but not all

[47] 1590, pp. 711-719.

[48] 1587, pp. 599, 600.

the changes are so innocuous; it is also added that Irish thieves say it is a sin to let slip the opportunity to steal, that the concubines and children of the priests make riot in the churches, that altars, services, and vestments are either foul or deficient in some way, and that the incumbents of many parishes are men of no learning, served by unsalaried curates.[49] These additions, virulent as they may be, are in keeping with the first and shorter form of the description.

We may well wonder from what source Camden secured all this provocative material. In the original text of 1586 he explains that his account of recent Irish customs is written in the very words, although the order has been changed, of a learned man who aims only at the truth, not at calumny, in describing the back-country Irish; and just below, in the margin, he adds, "A certain Jesuit, as far as I can discover, is the author of these observations."[50] The marginal reference to "A certain Jesuit" is omitted in all the succeeding editions, perhaps to avoid the then dangerous implication that a Jesuit could give a fair picture of anything; but the statement that the picture is a fair one remains, and, as we have seen, additional material of the same kind appears in 1587 and 1607. The next reference to the matter occurs in Ussher's long letter, already cited, of 30 October, 1606: "I would wish," he writes, "that the little Treatise, *De Moribus Hibern.* which you told me was written by *Good* the Jesuit, should be printed entirely without any alteration, and that in his own name; for so it will be far better taken by his Countrey-men, and the envy wholly derived from you unto him, to whom it more properly belongeth."[51] This Machiavellian advice is followed by Camden in the edition of 1607. After the reference to his learned source he adds, "His name, as I ascertain, was I. *Good*, who received his education at Oxford, who was a priest by profession, and who taught school in Limerick about the year 1566"; and Camden carefully encloses in quotation marks all but the last sentence of the original description and all the additions to which I have referred.[52] Before and after this long passage in quotes he now inserts some more material,

[49] 1607, pp. 790, 791, 790.
[50] 1587, p. 518.
[51] *Epistolae*, Part 1, p. 78.
[52] 1607, pp. 788, 789-792.

which is presumably of his own selection; but the consistent nature of the material within quotes and Ussher's private advice to print his source entirely and without alteration make it almost certain that Camden has given us the substance of Good's little treatise.

A precise identification of Good is obstructed by two difficulties. First, Ussher implies that he was an Irishman, but no Irish Jesuit named Good can be traced at this period. Secondly, Camden gives the initial of Good's first name as *I*, *i. e.*, either *I* or *J*; but, while there were English Catholics named John and James Good, no recorded priest or Jesuit named Good has the initial *I* or *J* at the time with which we are concerned.[53] Camden's statements that his author was educated at Oxford, became a priest, and taught school at Limerick about 1566, point rather to the English Jesuit, William Good. This by no means unknown Catholic priest was born at Glastonbury in 1527; was admitted to Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1545 or 1546; held a benefice in Somerset under Mary; withdrew to Tournay at the accession of Elizabeth; became one of the first English Jesuits in 1562; went with Archbishop Creagh to Ireland in 1564; opened a school at Limerick in the same year; returned to the Continent after remaining in Ireland either four or six years; introduced Robert Parsons to the spiritual exercises of Loyola in 1574; eventually became confessor of the new English College in Rome; and died at Naples, 5 July, 1586.[54] One biographer reports an interesting experience that befell Good: during his stay in Ireland he was attacked by robbers who carried off a bundle he had with him; finding that it contained altar furniture and surmising that he must be a priest, they returned to him; since he did not understand their language, one of them took Good's hand, made the sign of the Cross with it upon the other robbers, and had them do the

[53] Anthony à Wood, *Fasti* (in *Athenae Oxoniensis*, London, 1721), vol. 1, col. 89; Henry Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus* (London, 1877-1882), 4. 17 and 6. 249.

[54] Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxoniensis* (London, 1721), vol. 1, cols. 225-226; Thompson Cooper, article on William Good in *DNB*; Joseph Gillow, *A Literary and Bibliographical History . . . of the English Catholics* (London, n. d.), article on William Good; Louis Delplace, *L'Angleterre et la Compagnie de Jésus avant le Martyre du B. Edmond Campion* (Brussels, 1890), pp. 44-45; Myles V. Ronan, *The Reformation of Ireland under Elizabeth, 1558-1580* (London, 1930), p. 418.

the changes are so innocuous; it is also added that Irish thieves say it is a sin to let slip the opportunity to steal, that the concubines and children of the priests make riot in the churches, that altars, services, and vestments are either foul or deficient in some way, and that the incumbents of many parishes are men of no learning, served by unsalaried curates.[49] These additions, virulent as they may be, are in keeping with the first and shorter form of the description.

We may well wonder from what source Camden secured all this provocative material. In the original text of 1586 he explains that his account of recent Irish customs is written in the very words, although the order has been changed, of a learned man who aims only at the truth, not at calumny, in describing the back-country Irish; and just below, in the margin, he adds, "A certain Jesuit, as far as I can discover, is the author of these observations."[50] The marginal reference to "A certain Jesuit" is omitted in all the succeeding editions, perhaps to avoid the then dangerous implication that a Jesuit could give a fair picture of anything; but the statement that the picture is a fair one remains, and, as we have seen, additional material of the same kind appears in 1587 and 1607. The next reference to the matter occurs in Ussher's long letter, already cited, of 30 October, 1606: "I would wish," he writes, "that the little Treatise, *De Moribus Hibern.* which you told me was written by *Good* the Jesuit, should be printed entirely without any alteration, and that in his own name; for so it will be far better taken by his Countrey-men, and the envy wholly derived from you unto him, to whom it more properly belongeth."[51] This Machiavellian advice is followed by Camden in the edition of 1607. After the reference to his learned source he adds, "His name, as I ascertain, was I. *Good*, who received his education at Oxford, who was a priest by profession, and who taught school in Limerick about the year 1566"; and Camden carefully encloses in quotation marks all but the last sentence of the original description and all the additions to which I have referred.[52] Before and after this long passage in quotes he now inserts some more material,

[49] 1607, pp. 790, 791, 790.
[50] 1587, p. 518.
[51] *Epistolae*, Part 1, p. 78.
[52] 1607, pp. 788, 789-792.

which is presumably of his own selection; but the consistent nature of the material within quotes and Ussher's private advice to print his source entirely and without alteration make it almost certain that Camden has given us the substance of Good's little treatise.

A precise identification of Good is obstructed by two difficulties. First, Ussher implies that he was an Irishman, but no Irish Jesuit named Good can be traced at this period. Secondly, Camden gives the initial of Good's first name as *I*, *i. e.*, either *I* or *J*; but, while there were English Catholics named John and James Good, no recorded priest or Jesuit named Good has the initial *I* or *J* at the time with which we are concerned.[53] Camden's statements that his author was educated at Oxford, became a priest, and taught school at Limerick about 1566, point rather to the English Jesuit, William Good. This by no means unknown Catholic priest was born at Glastonbury in 1527; was admitted to Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1545 or 1546; held a benefice in Somerset under Mary; withdrew to Tournay at the accession of Elizabeth; became one of the first English Jesuits in 1562; went with Archbishop Creagh to Ireland in 1564; opened a school at Limerick in the same year; returned to the Continent after remaining in Ireland either four or six years; introduced Robert Parsons to the spiritual exercises of Loyola in 1574; eventually became confessor of the new English College in Rome; and died at Naples, 5 July, 1586.[54] One biographer reports an interesting experience that befell Good: during his stay in Ireland he was attacked by robbers who carried off a bundle he had with him; finding that it contained altar furniture and surmising that he must be a priest, they returned to him; since he did not understand their language, one of them took Good's hand, made the sign of the Cross with it upon the other robbers, and had them do the

[53] Anthony à Wood, *Fasti* (in *Athenae Oxoniensis*, London, 1721), vol. 1, col. 89; Henry Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus* (London, 1877-1882), 4. 17 and 6. 249.

[54] Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxoniensis* (London, 1721), vol. 1, cols. 225-226; Thompson Cooper, article on William Good in *DNB*; Joseph Gillow, *A Literary and Bibliographical History . . . of the English Catholics* (London, n. d.), article on William Good; Louis Delplace, *L'Angleterre et la Compagnie de Jésus avant le Martyre du B. Edmond Campion* (Brussels, 1890), pp. 44-45; Myles V. Ronan, *The Reformation of Ireland under Elizabeth, 1558-1580* (London, 1930), p. 418.

same upon himself, as if absolution were given all of them for their offense; then, gathering up the valuable altar furniture, they departed with it.[55] The priest who had this experience may very well have written the description of Irish manners in the *Britannia*. It is safe, in any case, to conjecture that William Good was probably the author of that description, as well as of the two or three other works which have been associated with his name.[56]

But the publication of Good's little treatise in the *Britannia* is likewise important for the light it throws on Camden's scholarship. His honesty and thoroughness are as apparent here as in the body of the Irish section: additional details, it is true, are found in the later versions of the treatise; but all its essential features are included from the first, and there is no evidence that Good is made responsible for additions that are really Camden's. The omission of the marginalium referring to "A certain Jesuit" is politic but not unscholarly. The presence, rather, of this marginalium in 1586 and the final decision, on the advice of Ussher, to give Good full and specific credit for his very unflattering account of Irish customs betray a point of view which goes beyond objective scholarship. Camden, like most Elizabethans, felt a strong aversion to the native Irish. His feelings seem, in fact, to have been much rather anti-Irish than anti-Catholic; and the use he makes of Good reminds us of those passages in Holinshed which cite another not too friendly work on Ireland by another English Catholic, Edmund Campion. But Camden's racial bias, even mingled as it is with a certain religious impartiality, is not typical of the *Britannia*; it represents his age rather than what distinguishes him in his age. For his unique importance as a scholar lies, not in his feelings or ideas, but in the scrupulous care with which he edits and compiles the facts.

Indiana University.

[55] Foley, 4.479 (quoted from Father More's *Hist. Prov. Angl.*, p. 13).

[56] See Cooper; Gillow; Leo Hicks, "The English College, Rome and Vocations to the Society of Jesus. March, 1579—July, 1595," *Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu*, 3, 8n.

CHARLES JOHNSON AND EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY DRAMA

By M. Maurice Shudofsky

The plays of Charles Johnson are little known even to students of early eighteenth-century drama; and there can be no doubt that from a literary point of view this neglect is justifiable. Yet Johnson is admittedly one of the most representative playwrights of the period. During his career in the theatre of more than two decades he wrote every type of play from pseudo-Heroic tragedy to political farce; and in his seventeen pieces is reflected practically every phase of the period's dramatic activity. Surely the study of such a man's work must be an aid in the fuller understanding of the Augustan theatre.

In his volume *Early Eighteenth-Century Drama* [1] Professor Nicoll states:

> Only through a study of the literary development and ideals of the stage of these years can we gain a true impression of the literary development and ideals of the eighteenth century; even particular works such as Pope's *The Dunciad* cannot properly be appreciated until we enter into the mysteries of the daily repertoire of Drury Lane and Lincoln's Inn Fields and of the Haymarket.

It need scarcely be said that in order to enter into the mysteries of the daily repertoire we must widen our knowledge of the minor dramatists. What kind of drama were the purveyors of the daily theatre-fare, men like Johnson, Sewell, and the younger Bullock, writing? How much do they derive from the past? What is their attitude toward Shakespeare and toward the canons of criticism current in their day? How do they meet the demands of the disparate tastes of early-eighteenth century audiences? In studying the plays of one of the most representative minor figures of the period, Charles Johnson, I have tried to answer these and other such questions.

Facts concerning the life of Charles Johnson are so scarce

[1] Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama* (Cambridge, Eng., 1925), p. 3.

that they can be counted on the fingers of one hand. The only certainties about his life are that he received a legal education; [2] that he enjoyed the life-long friendship of the eminent actor and manager of Drury Lane, Robert Wilks; [3] that he fell foul of Pope's malignant pen and was included in the "Wasp's" gallery of dunces; and that he ceased writing for the stage in 1732 when his bourgeois tragedy, *Caelia*, failed. Nothing is known of him after this. The *Biographia* gives March 11, 1748, as the date of his death.[4]

[2] According to the *Biographia Dramatica* he was born in 1679. Thomas Seccombe, in the *DNB*, adds that he was admitted to the Middle Temple. There can be no doubt of Johnson's early legal training, for in the preface to his tragicomedy *The Successful Pyrate*, he speaks of "The Honourable Profession of the Law in which I was educated." But there is no record of his admission to any of the four Inns of Court. Both Baker and Seccombe were probably misled by the signature to Johnson's *Love and Liberty* which reads: "From my Chambers in the Middle Temple, November 25, 1708." This does not necessarily mean that the playwright was a member of the Middle Temple; non-members were also permitted to rent chambers in the Temple building.

[3] "This Gentleman," writes Benjamin Victor of Johnson: "was very fortunate in the Friendship of Mr. *Wilks*, who at all times exerted his Powers as Manager and Actor to serve him." (*A History of the Theatres* 1. 110.)

[4] The same source tells us that "he form'd so extensive an acquaintanceship and intimacy, as constantly ensured him great emoluments on his benefit night, by which means being a man of oeconomy, he was enabled to subsist very genteely." From a letter to Pope by Henry Cromwell we learn that Johnson's comedy *The Wife's Relief* alone netted him three hundred pounds. The *Biographia* also informs us that after his retirement from the theatre, Johnson marreid a young widow with a tolerable fortune and became the proprietor of a tavern in Bow Street, which he gave up when his wife died. I have discovered an entry in the marriage-records of Gray's Inn Chapel reading: "Charles Johnson of the Parish of St. Anne, Westminster, married Mary Bradbury of same, 14 December, 1708." It is impossible to prove that this Charles Johnson is our author; we know, however, that the playwright was living at Gray's Inn in 1704.

Edmund Curll, the piratical bookseller and publisher, comments briefly on the dramatist in a pamphlet entitled *Characters of the Times*: "Charles Johnson, famous for writing a play every season, and for being at *Button's* every day. He had probably thriven better in his Vocation had he been a small matter leaner. He may be justly called a Martyr to obesity, and to have fallen a victim to the rotundity of his parts."

The actor and historian of the theatre, Benjamin Victor, has this to say of him: "I had the Pleasure of Mr. Johnson's Acquaintance. He was a modest, sensible Man, very comely in his Person, but rather too corpulent. This Author was greatly hurt at finding himself introduced in the *Dunciad*, as he was not conscious of having ever given the least Offence to any one; but it seems he was too large an object to be miss'd."

From the scattered and fragmentary references to him Charles Johnson emerges as an amiable fat gentleman, fond of the coffee-house and the tavern. Like his

It is obvious to anyone who reads Johnson's plays that on purely literary grounds he is entitled to little consideration. It is not my intention in this article to rediscover a forgotten dramatic giant in the person of Charles Johnson. He was first and foremost a versatile, if not always judicious, adapter; his pieces are clearly not of the stuff which makes enduring drama. The compensation to be derived from the study of such a minor figure is to be sought rather in the domain of literary and social history. Johnson's seventeen [5] plays give us an excellent glimpse of the true nature of the English drama during the first three decades of the eighteenth century and at the same time mirror the political and social milieu in which he lived and wrote. For Johnson was admittedly the practicing playwright, whose main objective was to please. Professor Nicoll calls him "thoroughly representative of his age" and "a man who was ever seeking for new dramatic media."

It is common knowledge that early eighteenth-century drama failed to achieve artistic unity chiefly because it had to cater to heterogeneous audiences of diverse tastes. The Restoration stage had drawn its audience from a homogeneous court coterie; but with the advent of the new century, the court clique lost its hold on the theatre. Classes which had previously no voice in theatric matters now demanded to be heard and catered to. Managers and playwrights were obliged to plan and write for vast audiences with no common denominator of taste. The constant effort on the part of dramatists to please aristocrat, bourgeois, and pantomime-loving illiterate in one and the same play is mainly responsible for the disjointedness and the psychological falsity of the typical Augustan piece. Great dramatists would doubtless have risen above such difficulties, but not the Cibbers and the Hills and the Johnsons.

more illustrious namesake, he seems to have been a "clubable" man, an habitué of Button's and Will's, where he could listen to (and perhaps participate in) the discussions of the most eminent *littérateurs* of Augustan London.

[5] Two anonymous plays, *The Gentleman-Cully* (1701) and *Fortune in her Wits* (1705), have been attributed to Johnson. The latter, however, calls *Love and Liberty* (1709) his "Virgin Effort." An examination of these plays will show that the attribution, made by the usually unreliable Thomas Coxeter, is unfounded. For a discussion of *The Gentleman-Cully*, see my article in *MLN*, 55 (1940), 396-400. Johnson also published two long poems, *Marlborough: On the Late Glorious Victory near Hochstet in Germany* (1704) and *The Queen: A Pindarick Ode* (1705).

The works of Johnson constitute an excellent illustration of this fatal weakness of the period's drama. In play after play we find him carefully balancing those dramatic elements especially relished by each audience-group, in much the same way as a manager of a vaudeville show arranges his "acts" to satisfy spectators of varying tastes. There is the inevitable sentimental coloring, the somewhat laborious effort at reproduction of Restoration wit, and the hornpipe and dances before the final curtain. Even when Johnson is writing neo-classic tragedy, he none the less infuses a bit of sentimentalism to please the bourgeois. Dennis and Gildon might preach and practice dramatic chastity, penning their "regular" tragedies for empty stalls; but playwrights like Johnson knew full well that English audiences are bored by long *tirades* and narrated dénouements. When, therefore, he adapts Racine's *Iphigénie*, he prunes the long speeches and makes a garish pageant of the scene involving the heroine's deliverance.

To the student of Shakespeare and his "improvers," Johnson's *Love in a Forest*, an adaptation of *As You Like It*, is of considerable interest, inasmuch as it enables us to see at first hand the liberties which the adapters took with Shakespeare, notwithstanding the high praise they constantly bestowed upon him. The rifacimento is also another illustration of the period's injudicious eclecticism. A playwright, dubbed "thoroughly representative of his age," approaches *As You Like It* in 1723 and concludes that "the sacred Bard's immortal Lyre" is definitely in need of tuning. He will add scenes from such widely divergent plays as *Much Ado About Nothing* and *Richard II*; he will manage to include the diverting horse-play of the Athenian base mechanicals, even if it must be dragged in by the heels; and he will also bring in the barbed challenges of Bolingbroke and Mowbray to appeal to those theatregoers who relish the buskined line of martial bravado. Pot-pourris like *Love in a Forest* do not make pleasant reading, but they go far in explaining why early eighteenth-century drama rarely rises above mediocrity.

In the following pages I will attempt to show how three important aspects of the drama of this period are graphically illustrated in the plays of this representative theaterman. I will confine my attention to the persistence of Heroic characteristics

in tragedy, the application of the moral-immoral formula in comedy, and the "pulpitizing" of the stage in bourgeois tragedy.

2

In 1678 John Dryden abandoned his "long-loved Mistress, Rhyme" and wrote his tragedy *All for Love* in blank verse. But though the couplet was as a rule[6] no longer used, many of the characteristics of Heroic drama persisted well into the eighteenth century.[7] Typically Heroic scenes of love-and-honor and rant abound in Augustin tragedy; characters like the all-conquering hero, the self-sacrificing friend, the seraphic heroine, and the lecherous tyrant re-appear in play after play as late as the middle of the eighteenth century. A play like Johnson's *Love and Liberty* (1709) is almost incomprehensible without reference to the drama of Dryden and Orrery. It is important to remember, also, that the tragedies of Dryden, Settle, and Lee, among others, were constantly revived; and the new dramatists, when they were not writing Heroic plays in blank verse, introduced at least a modicum of the genre's elements into their work.[8]

In the two seasons immediately preceding the publication of Johnson's *Love and Liberty*, the Heroic play occupied a fairly respectable position in the repertoire. During the season 1707-8, no fewer than twelve Heroic pieces were performed,[9] a pretty good figure when one remembers that tragedy enjoyed less popularity than other dramatic and semi-dramatic forms. During the season 1708-9, the year in which *Love and Liberty* was published, approximately one hundred and eighty-one performances were given by the united[10] companies at Drury

[6] It should be noted that some few plays were written in rhyme even after 1680. For a list of such pieces see Professor Nicoll's *A History of Restoration Drama*, p. 90, n. 2.

[7] Cf. Professor Nicoll (*op. cit.*, p. 91, n. 2): "Heroic plays did not die with rime as many produced from 1680 onwards can testify. There was a perfect galaxy of blank verse tragedies in the eighteenth century with most decided heroic characteristics."

[8] As late as 1730 Fielding in his *Tom Thumb* was aiming many of his satiric shafts at the excesses of Heroic tragedy.

[9] Genest, 2. 387-406. Genest's lists are incomplete; there may have been additional performances.

[10] On January 13, 1708, the company which had been acting at the Haymarket under the direction of Owen Swiney, Cibber, Dogget, and Wilks, rejoined the Drury Lane troupe, from which they had seceded in 1706.

Lane. Of these only thirty-eight nights were devoted to tragedy. Only eleven of the thirty-eight Heroic plays occupied the boards, including such established pieces as *The Conquest of Granada, Aureng-Zebe, Sophonisba, Alexander the Great*; or *The Rival Queens, The Heir of Morocco*, and *The Indian Queen*.

A comparison between *Love and Liberty* and its source, Fletcher's *The Double Marriage*, will show clearly how strong the Heroic note was in the eighteenth century.

The plot of the Jacobean play is briefly as follows: Ferrand, an Arragonian, has seized the throne of Naples and rules tyrannically. His insufferable despotism stirs Virolet, a noble gentleman, and his patriotic friends, to plot Ferrand's overthrow. Juliana, Virolet's devoted and virtuous wife, seconds her husband's conspiracy; but Brissonet and Camillo, his confederates, desert him when he refuses to accept Ronvere, the tyrant's villainous aide. Ronvere proceeds to disclose the plot, and Juliana persuades Virolet to go into hiding. Soon, the conspirators, including Juliana and her father-in-law, Pandulpho, are taken into custody. The rack fails to ring from Juliana the secret of Virolet's whereabouts, so that the wily Ferrand resorts to another expedient. He accordingly pardons the conspirators, Virolet included, on condition that they bring him the head of Sesse, a duke whom the usurper has proscribed and who has taken to piracy in reprisal. The frustrated conspirators accept Ferrand's proposal, and captained by Virolet, they put out to sea.

The scene now shifts to the pirate's vessel. Virolet has been captured by Sesse and his Amazonian daughter, Martia. The latter comes to scoff at her prize but stays to sue for his love, which Virolet grants her; and they escape together, taking with them Ascanio, nephew to Ferrand and heir to the throne, who had been held as a hostage on board Sesse's vessel. When Virolet returns to Naples, he divorces his devoted wife and marries Martia; but he cannot bring himself "to satisfie her flames," so stricken is he with remorse for having cast off Juliana. Her love spurned, Martia threatens to become a strumpet.

Meanwhile, Sesse and his men have gained the shore to engage the usurper in battle. Virolet disguises himself as Ronvere; and when Juliana spies the villain, who has been instrumental in disrupting her happy marriage, she kills him. Upon

learning the identity of her victim, Juliana dies of a broken heart. Sesse routs Ferrand's mercenaries, bestows the throne upon Ascanio, has the traitorous Martia executed, and puts out to sea once more. Fletcher's comic relief consists of the tedious antics of Villio, a clown, and Castruchio, a parasite.

Johnson changes the names of Fletcher's characters as follows:

The Double Marriage	*Love and Liberty*
Farrand, tyrant of Naples	Alberto
Virolet, a noble gentleman	Castruchio
Ronvere, a villain	Ronveir
Juliana, wife to Virolet	Dardania

The adapter retains the names of Martia and Ascanio; the former, however, becomes the daughter of Alberto, while the latter is no longer the recognized heir apparent, but the lawful ruler whose throne has been usurped. Johnson eliminates two characters of major importance, *viz.*, Sesse, Ferrand's arch-enemy, and Pandulpho, Virolet's father. Also excluded are the two ennui-provoking clowns, Villio and Castruchio.

To accord with the canons of criticism current in his day, the adapter achieves all three unities by eliminating the character of Sesse, thus enabling him to concentrate all his action at court, whereas Fletcher must shift his scene from Naples to the sea and back. But even if the retention of Sesse had been structurally permissible, Johnson would none the less have been obliged to dispense with him; for his presence would have detracted considerably from the heroic stature of Castruchio, who is cut from pattern for the perfect hero. In the very first scene of *The Double Marriage* we learn that Virolet's chief ambition is to free his people from the shackles of Ferrand; but as the play progresses, his patriotic fervor cools, and the mantle of national liberator falls to Sesse, who deposes the usurper and proclaims Ascanio.

Every important change that Johnson makes in plot and character is directed toward heroicizing the Jacobean tragedy. In *Love and Liberty* tyrannic love holds undisputed sway. "Love governs absolute everywhere," announces Cupid at the beginning of Act 2. Ronveir, too, declares that

all Cares
Of State, of Empire, and of Preservation,
Yield to the mightier Call of powerful Love.[11]

Castruchio loves Dardania, Alberto loves Dardania, Martia loves Castruchio, and Ronveir loves Dardania and Martia.

The first step in the heroicization of the tragedy is to motivate the King's every move by his passion for Dardania. Fletcher's Ferrand is a crafty ruler, bent on destroying his most dangerous foes, Sesse and Virolet. Alberto, on the other hand, can think only of his love for the heroine, and he is even willing to forget Castruchio's conspiracy if she will satisfy his lust. The love-sick monarch implores:

Oh, I'm all Misery! Doubts! Hopes! Despair!
Yield, yield to my Embraces, and I'll give thee Empire
Give thy *Castruchio* Freedom—every Wish,
Woud you but love, *Dardania*. (3. 2, p. 21.)

Johnson's Alberto is the hackneyed lecherous despot of Heroic tragedy. Love constitutes his only occupation; and Dardania is the guiding-star of his love-laden life.

I love her more than Hero's Arms and Glory.
Placed in my Heart I find the precious Gem,
Her brillaint Image plays with Lustre there!
Set round with Darts and Flames and golden Joys.
(3. 2, p. 16.)

The heroicizing of Castruchio stands out most conspicuously. The hero of *Love and Liberty* bears almost no resemblance to his counterpart, Virolet. The latter is in conception—though not in development and dramatic power—akin to the tragic figures of Shakespeare. He is a noble, public-minded citizen, bent on removing the one serious obstruction to the liberty and happiness of his country. But the Carmen-like, amoral Martia sweeps him off his feet, and he becomes temporarily oblivious of the great love he bears his wife, at the same time forgetting the plight of his country, to whose liberation he has solemnly pledged himself. Virolet's infatuation with Martia is made stronger by her willingness to sacrifice everything for him. Quite humanly he attempts to rationalize his perfidy, but he soon realizes that his rationalization does not

[11] 3. 3. All references are to the quarto of 1709, the only edition.

pass muster. In fine, Virolet is from beginning to end a human being, with the passions and emotions and weaknesses that flesh is heir to.

Fletcher's hero has suffered a sea change in the adaptation. Virolet is taken through the Heroic-tragedy mill and emerges a hero *sans peur et sans reproche*. Like Dryden's superman, Almanzor, Castruchio dominates the scene from the first curtain to the last; no Sesse is permitted to share the limelight with him. The King is envious of the hero:

> That Villain is my Horror,
> *Ronveir*! He rivals me in Love and Empire.
> My Subjects doat upon the popular Slave. (2. 1, p. 15.)

When the rightful king, Ascanio, comes back to Naples, it is to Castruchio that he turns, imploring him to assume leadership of the revolutionary forces. The flawless hero must invariably be *semper fidelis*; it would not do for him to prove faithless to his beloved. It is only after Martia has lied to him about the death of Dardania that Castruchio deigns to be obligated to her for his freedom. He does not, like Virolet, pledge his love to the princess; nor does he ever evince the slightest affection for her. Unlike Virolet, Castruchio does not remain in hiding while his beloved is being tortured. Instead, he stalks in to indulge in his favorite pastime—king-huffing.

The character of Martia, too, is cast in the Heroic mold. Until Act 2, she seems to be an ordinary young woman of good training—shy, modest, and obedient; after the second act, however, she becomes indistinguishable from a long line of "heavy" villainesses, who are generally consumed by an illicit "flame" for the hero. A hopeless love for Castruchio transforms the hitherto modest girl into a she-devil, to whom perjury, treachery, and murder are trifles. In Act 4, when Castruchio denounces her fraud and asserts that Dardania alone is his beloved, Martia rants:

> Oh curst Deceiver! Damn'd Villain! hear me;
> . . . . . .
> On her I'll double my destructive Rage,
> You have her now and pride in her possession;
> But from this Moment shield her from my Sight,
> For if again she meet her Rival's Eyes,
> Expect to hear that they have flash'd her dead.
>
> (4. 3,, pp. 50-1.)

I have focussed my attention on the Heroic aspect of this tragedy because it is the most striking feature of the piece. A play like *Love and Liberty* is incontrovertible proof that the Heroic strain did not die with rhyme, and that many elements of Restoration tragedy were taken over bodily by the eighteenth century.[12]

[12] The adaptation is made to conform rigidly to the critical canons of the day. We have already seen that the adapter achieves all three unities by eliminating the character of Sesse, whose presence in the original is principally responsible for their violation. First, with Sesse excluded, unity of place is gained by confining the scene to the palace and a street adjacent to it; second, since no shifts of scene from court to sea are necessary, the time required for the action need not exceed twenty-four hours; in fact, twelve or fewer would suffice. Finally, unity of action is achieved by reducing the number of central figures to one.

The next step calculated to bring the adaptation into line with prevailing critical theory is the exclusion of the comic interludes; the commingling of the comic with the serious was one of the pet bugaboos of neo-classic criticism. Though the leading critics were divided on the principle of poetic justice, most of the playwrights usually adhered to it. In his source Johnson found the good suffering alike with the bad. True, some justification might be found for the unhappy end of Virolet; after all he was unfaithful to his wife. The tragic end of the constant and virtuous Juliana, however, is undeserved. No such violation of poetic justice is permitted by Johnson. We have already seen that the adapter makes a perfect hero of Virolet and a seraphic being of the heroine. Both are convinced that their deliverance had been effected by an all-seeing Providence. When Castruchio and Dardania are re-united, the former cries:

> She lives! Eternal Providence
> Has my *Dardania* to my Arms restor'd!
> . . . . . .
> Thou art Heaven's Darling Care, and all the Gods
> Now crown thy Wishes, and reward thy Vertue. (5. 3, p. 63.)

Professor Nicoll observes (*Early Eighteenth Century Drama*, p. 105) that *Love and Liberty* "is noticeable for its union of heroic sentiments and pathos." I must confess that I can discern little of the pathetic in the play. There is a deal of genuine pathos in *The Double Marriage*, centering about the hapless Juliana. The latter might well have served as a model for the wronged and long-suffering wife of later sentimental comedies, for her predicament is pathetic in the extreme. (See especially her leave-taking of Virolet and Martia in Act 4.) The pathetic situations in which Juliana is involved culminate in her murdering the man she loves. Virolet is almost as pathetic as his wife, for though he is a man of fortitude and understanding, he is none the less frustrated at every turn, a good deal of the frustration stemming from his own weakness.

The pathos of which Johnson might have availed himself is deliberately overlooked. Writing in the first decade of the eighteenth century, Johnson had a choice of models before him. He might have cast his tragedy in the pathetic mold of the later Otway and of Southerne, especially since *The Double Marriage* lends itself so readily to pathetic treatment; but instead he chose to exploit the Heroic. By making the hero faithful to his wife throughout, the adapter removes the greatest source of pathos. True, Dardania is for a while in danger of violation by

3

Charles Johnson was a playwright who perceived when the dramatic tide was turning.[13] When he sits down to write a comedy in 1716, he accordingly defers to the oncoming sentimentalism, but at the same time he realizes that there are frequenters of Drury Lane who would not willingly let the old comedy die. Johnson may have been genuinely sentimental, but his plays indicate that he was nothing if not a tireless seeker after the regnant taste or tastes of his public; and writing in 1716, he doubtless appreciated the fact that sentimentalism had not yet prevailed to the exclusion of all other comic elements.[14] In other words, sentimentalism was definitely in need of a Steele and a Lillo. The dramatists and playsmiths active in the first two decades of the eighteenth century did not deem it safe to write exclusively in the sentimental vein; they introduced a bit of all the comic elements in their work; hence the pot-pourri nature of the period's drama. In practically every one of his plays, prior to his fullfledged bourgeois tragedy, *Caelia*, we find Johnson carefully balancing the elements of the old comedy with those of the gradually emerging sentimental play, in much the same way as a juggler keeps several balls in mid-air.[15] In 1716 sentimentalism was on the rise, though it had not yet dethroned the old comedy; for the vogue of Restoration comedy, with its hard, cynical surface some-

the King, but there is nothing pathetic about that inasmuch as her words and action indicate that Providence will protect her at all times. *Love and Liberty* abounds in Heroic sentiments but contains very little of the pathetic.

[13] Cf. Professor Nicoll's statement: "Johnson was ever ready to take advantage of current fashions in the theatrical world" (*op. cit.*, p. 242). Cf. also Professor Nettleton's description of the playwright as "a minor dramatist who usually had his ear to the ground." (*English Drama of the Restoration and Eighteenth Century*, p. 209.)

[14] Cf. Professor Bernbaum (*The Drama of Sensibility*, pp. 139-40): "The drama of sensibility was still far from driving its rivals off the stage, and showed too few signs of vigor and fertility. The ideas that ruled the literary world still preponderated against its spirit. Its authors seemed to lack the venturesome enthusiasm which springs from the sincere belief that one's ideals of life are the only real ones."

[15] The successful eighteenth-century playwrights had to include some features of opera and pantomime in their plays; these semi-dramatic forms were so popular that for a while they threatened to eclipse the legitimate drama. The prologues and epilogues were constantly inveighing against the degenerate taste of the public for preferring them.

what softened and without the superb cadenced prose of an Etherege or a Congreve, persisted, like Heroic tragedy, well into the eighteenth century.[16] The *sforzando* blasts against the stage by no means ceased with the exit of Congreve and company. In 1719 Arthur Bedford [17] was still able to cite act and scene of numerous contemporary plays in his attack on the continuing blasphemy and immorality of the stage. Despite, then, the growing importance of the bourgeoisie, the taste for Restoration comedy suffered no eclipse. Theatergoers who had been and still were diverted by its wit and tickled by its suggestiveness demanded similar fare from the playwrights of the day.

Johnson may have learned from Colley Cibber how to oscillate adroitly between the comedy of manners and the sentimental play. Even a cursory reading of Johnson's *The Country Lasses* will reveal the similarity of its balancing technique to that of *Love's Last Shift*. Cibber's moral-immoral formula is the key to an understanding of Augustin comedy, for his was a technique admirably suited to an age in which the Restoration spirit had not yet died and sentimentalism had not yet triumphed.

For a graphic illustration of this juggling technique let us turn to Johnson's *The Country Lasses*, his best and most successful comedy.[18] The plot of this piece is very simple. Heartwell and Modely, two London sparks, come into the country and fall in love with the country lasses, Flora and Aura respectively. Freehold, the supposed [19] father of the girls, was for-

[16] It should be remembered, of course, that the comedies of Congreve, Wycherly, and Vanbrugh, were dramatic staples in the repertoire.

[17] *Serious Remonstrances in Behalf of the Christian Religion* (London, 1719). Bedford claimed to have gathered about seven thousand instances of blasphemy and impiety "taken out of the plays of the present century and especially of the last five years."

[18] Produced on February 4, 1715, at Drury Lane (Genest, 2. 549), it held the stage for almost a century, the last recorded performance being at Bath on December 7, 1813. Between 1715, the date of its publication, and 1779, the comedy went through five editions. Two adaptations were made of it, one by Dr. William Kenrick entitled *The Lady of the Manor* in 1778, and the second by John Philip Kemble, *The Farm House*, in 1789.

[19] In his summary of the plot, Professor Nicoll erroneously remarks that Flora and Aura are "the daughters of Freehold." After her marriage to Heartwell, Flora discloses that she is the Lady of the Manor.

merly a city gentleman. He permits the Londoners to spend the night on his farm but warns them that if they make any advances to his "daughters," he will loose his mastiff on them. Heartwell is smitten with the beauty of Flora, but his intentions are strictly dishonorable. When she repulses him, he begs her to forgive him and to marry him, both of which she does. Modely, the confirmed rake, however, scorns marriage as a means of gaining the favors of Aura; and when he tries violence, Freehold rushes in and sentences him to a bout with the mastiff. Modely consents to marry Aura, but she decides to put him on probation for two years. The play is brought to a close with a sermonette by Heartwell to his only half-reclaimed friend, in which virtue is extolled as the only "real lasting Good."

There is also a subplot, based on Middleton's *A Mad World My Masters*, in which Lurcher, the prodigal nephew of Sir John English, is reinstated into the good graces of his uncle after he abandons his riotous living and is completely reformed.[20]

One of the chief aspects of sentimentalism in the drama; namely, the rehabilitation of the country and its inhabitants, is interestingly illustrated in *The Country Lasses*. To the highly sophisticated, cityfied court circles of the Restoration a

[20] The Reverend Montagu Summers calls *The Country Lasses* "a rifacimento of *The Custom of the Manor* and Aphra Behn's *The City Heiress*." (Aphra Behn, *Works*, ed Summers, 2. 197.) A comparison of the three plays, however, will show that Johnson derives independently and directly from Middleton. *The City Heiress* is shot through with satire against the Whigs; and Sir Timothy Treat-All, the Sir Bounteous Progress of Middleton and the Sir John English of Johnson, is a satire on Shaftesbury. Johnson may have known Behn's play, but he makes no use of it.

Every commentator who has spoken of *The Country Lasses* has said that Johnson took his main plot from Fletcher's *The Custom of the Country*. This is true only of the lord's so-called prerogative. In Fletcher's play this custom is the motive force of the whole action. There the Governor demands a husband's right to the bride Zenoica, who flees to Lisbon with her husband in order to escape the dishonor. Thereafter, the play deals with the fortunes and misfortunes attendant upon the couple. In Johnson, the custom of the manor is an anti-climax, a little harmless joke played upon the impatient bridegroom, and is not functional in the least. Moreover, the characters of *The Country Lasses* do not bear the slightest resemblance to those of the Caroline play. It is therefore misleading to refer to the main plot of the Augustin comedy as taken from Fletcher, because the custom of the manor is a cypher in the structural development of Johnson's comedy and can be removed without inflicting any damage on it.

person living in the country was inevitably the bumpkin, totally lacking in those virtues and vices indispensable to the polished, urban wit.[21] With the advance of the eighteenth century, the pendulum swung to the other extreme, and the country became identified with everything pure and wholesome. *The Beaux Stratagem* represents an early phase of this phenomenon; Farquhar takes his play into the country, away from the drawing room of Lady Tattle and Mrs. Scandal and Lord Foppington. But though Farquhar chooses a rustic maiden for his heroine, he none the less refrains from raptures over the beauties of the country and the virtues of those who dwell there.[22] Farquhar was the pioneer; it remained for his successors, among whom was Johnson, to sing the praises of the new *milieu*.

The subject of city *versus* country is frequently debated by Flora and Aura. In Act 1 the former inveighs at length against London, where

> credit is the Pawn of Knaves, and fattens upon the Avarice of Fools; Religion has been made the Politician's Bubble, and Honours Publick Merchandise, and what ought to be the Distinction of Virtue, has been made the Price of Sin—The Tyrant Money governs all, there every thing is venal; Faith, Fame, Friendship, Reason and Religion, nay Love, my Dear, Love is bought and sold there too. . . . With us now every thing is unadorn'd by Art, and looks so beautiful in the Dress of Nature, so Innocent, simple, and Undisguis'd.

Aura now presents her views:

> Ay; but there is a sort of wearisom Dulness that waits upon our Simplicity: Now here we must travel seven Miles . . . to a beggarly Country Village, which you pompously style our Market Town, where we may by Chance see two Things that look like

[21] When asked by Sir William Witwoud whether she will accept his invitation to go walking, Millamant (the epitome of urban sophistication) replies: "I nauseate walking; 'tis a country diversion, I loathe the country and everything that relates to it." (*The Way of the World*, 4. 4.)

[22] Mrs. Sullen is very contemptuous of the country. The surface influence of Farquhar's comedy is discernible in Johnson's play. Heartwell and Modely resemble Archer and Aimwell; both groups of characters come into the country and fall in love with two women there. But aside from a suggestion for character delineation and perhaps a hint for the opening incident, Johnson takes nothing from *The Beaux Stratagem*; Farquhar's plot is entirely different, and its heroines, Dorinda and Mrs. Sullen, bear little resemblance to Flora and Aura.

intelligent Beings, the Parson and the Attorney; or it may be some younger brother of some Neighbouring Lord of the Manor, whose Face carries the colour of *October*, and his Shape of the Hogshead he feeds on; who drinks so constantly and so much, as if all the Religion he has been ever taught was, That Man was created to swallow a prodigious quantity of Stale Beer.[23]

The playwright lets Aura speak her mind, but it is obvious that he is interested in making Flora's point of view more attractive.

Chief among the sentimental block of characters are Flora and Heartwell. The latter, though a Londoner, is from the very outset a Bevil *in posse*. He succumbs to the charms of Flora, and, true to his pernicious urban training, offers to make her his mistress. Flora's answer to this proposal is pregnant with moral indignation, and she spurns his proffered riches:

All the Inheritance I boast or wish for is this low humble Cottage and a Mind, I hope a Virtuous Mind, that cannot even in this Situation bear Dishonour; take back your worthless Trifle of a Heart, and your more worthless Promises, and know I scorn as much to yield to the mean Bargain of your hireling Passion, as you do to submit to Honourable Love.

Ripe for conversion, Heartwell is deeply impressed with his charmer's words, and he begs her to allow him a few moments of thought; but Flora, realizing her advantage over the vacillating lover, continues. This time her words are tinged with a deeper sentimental hue:

Think then, ungrateful Man, what 'tis you do! My Father, whose Prop I am, the Stay of his old Age, taught me with Pious Care to tread the Paths of Virtue; how wou'd it tear the Strings of his old Heart to see me fal'n at once to Shame and Infamy? You call your self a Gentleman, and say, the Laws of Faith and Honour when they're broke ask Life for Recompense, the *Lye* is Death: Yet you wou'd falsify your Truth to him; defraud him of his Treasure in his Child, inhospitably murther your good Host; the Man whose House you enter'd with a Trust, that wou'd to common Thieves under these Limitations be Sacred and Inviolable.

This is more than enough for Heartwell; he is completely converted:

Oh thou hast touch'd my Soul! I *feel* thy Words, a conscious Pang stabs thro' my Heart, and covers me with Shame; yet *Flora*, yet I

[23] *The Country Lasses*, London, 1716. 1. 1, pp. 17-18. All references are to this edition.

hope you will forgive me when you think how strongly we are bias'd to what is Wrong; Custom, Family, Fortune, O I know not what terrible Words make me fear to suffer in Opinion only. Oh *Flora, Flora*, thou hast conquer'd; I own my Crime, and humbly beg you will forgive me. . . . Nature has form'd thee fair as her own Lillies; no Family can mend, no Education teach, no Habit improve your Manners.

So complete is Heartwell's conversion to the sweetness and light of the country that he even edifies his friend, Modely, with a sermonette at the conclusion of the play:

Let these Accidents, *George*, hereafter, when you shall please to think, make you remember, that there is no lasting Good but in Virtue, and that the greatest Happiness below consists, however Libertines and Halfwits may affect to ridicule it, in Honourable Love.

The verse-tag which rings down the final curtain grinds the same axe:

> When Heaven conspicuous Merit wou'd regard,
> A Virtuous Woman is the great Reward.
> This lovely Blessing sweetens Life alone,
> Sooths all our Ills, and keeps hard Fortune down;
> Gives us an Antepast of Joys above,
> Beauty and Virtue, Harmony and Love.

Freehold supplements Flora's sentiments. His quarrel is with Modely, who has failed to keep his promise not to molest Aura. In Act 4 the rake attempts to use "a little agreeable Force" on Aura, who summons aid. Freehold is about to pronounce sentence on the offender:

Free. Well, Sir, what have you to say now, why Sentence shou'd not pass?

Mode. Say! why I say, Sir, that what I did was according to Common Law; and the Common Law is custom, and that it has been the Custom Time out of Mind, for us young Fellows, whose Blood flows briskly to use no Ceremony with a wholesome Cherry Cheek, whether it be on Haycock, Meadow, Barn or Bed.

Free. Extremely well! and so you wou'd have knock'd her down and ravish'd her.

Mode. A little agreeable force is necessary, it saves the Woman's Honour and gives such an Edge to the Appetite.

Free. Ay! And so having finish'd this honourable Affair, that is, having robb'd the poor Girl of all that cou'd be dear or valuable, having dishonour'd her, disgraced your self and done an irreparable Wrong; why you cou'd have hum'd a Tune, taken a Pinch of Snuff, sat down perfectly satisfied in the Probity of the Action, and have reconcil'd your self to your own Reflections with as much Ease as you drink a Dish of Tea.

When asked what provoked him to this outrage, Modely replied that it was love. Freehold corrects him:

Let me tell you, Friend, you mistake your Passion; 'tis not Love, but Lust; Love is a generous Volunteer, Lust a Mercenary Slave; Love is a Court of Honour in the Heart, but what you call Love is only a scandalous Itching, a Rebellion in the Blood. . . . Thou art a modern Whoremaster, that is, a Villain; and I have Charity enough to tell thee so. . . . You have broken every social Virtue, and yet impudently imagine you are in the Character of a Gentleman. . . . A gentleman ought not to dare think of doing Wrong to any—His Love, his Friendship, his Courage, his Generosity, his Religion, his Word, and his Honour, shou'd be inviolably bound to the strict Law of Virtue. . . . As you are—Your Love is Lust; your Friendship, Interest; your Courage, brutal Butcher; your Bounty, Usury; your Religion, Hypocrisy; your Word, a Lye; and your Honour, a Jest. (4. 2, pp. 72-4.)

The verbal set-to between Freehold and Modely continues briskly, with the former supplying the moralizing and the latter cynically laughing the old gentleman to scorn. When considered more carefully, it will be found that the quotation above is more than a mere battle of words. In truth, it is a summation of two irreconcilable points of view—those of Bevil and Horner, the old conception of the gentleman-rake *versus* the sentimental hero. Freehold's words are indeed perfectly descriptive of the new conception of the gentleman, a person who "ought not to dare think of doing wrong to any."

From the foregoing remarks and citations the reader may gather that *The Country Lasses* is permeated with sentimentalism; this, however, is only one side of the story. True, Johnson's accent is unmistakably on the sentimental; but the sentimentalism of Flora and Heartwell is effectively neutralized by Aura and Modely, both of whom are clearly in the Restoration tradition.

Aura is a born coquette, and it is her flirtatious nature which helps to bring about Modely's attempt to seduce her. She seems to repulse his advances because she cannot do otherwise in her pious environment; and her indignation is more apparent than real. In contrast to Flora, Aura is totally unappreciative of the country, the inhabitants of which she calls "savages." At the beginning of the play the coquette tells her cousin that she is determined to leave for London. Asked why, she replies:

> Only to see some of my own Species, a few Men and Women, for I cannot look upon the Things [country lads and lassies] we talked to just now but as Beings between Men and Beasts, and of an inferior Nature to People who grow in Cities; if I stay longer among these Savages, I shall not have Vanity enough to keep my self clean; I must go to *London* to recover my Pride, 'tis starving here.

In the same scene, after Flora has delivered herself of a long *tirade* on the virtues of country life,[24] Aura brushes her words aside in a way that brings to mind the inimitable Millamant. "O' my Word," she says, "you declaim Child like a Country School-master: yet after all, People bred in Society, who can talk and look, and Lye and Bow a little, are as much superior to these Clowns as Angels are to them." (1. 1, p. 17.)

Aura maintains her cynicism and *savoir faire* until the end. With an indifference bordering on ennui she listens to the harangues on virtue and kindred subjects, issuing in abunddance from the mouths of Flora and Heartwell. Even when Modely promises to behave if she will allow him "to sink into a Husband" her attitude remains unchanged. One feels that she is inwardly smirking at the absurdity of Modely's reformation under pressure. Their last verbal exchange makes an amusing bit of counterpoint to the sentimental saccharine of Heartwell, Lurcher, Sir John, and Flora.

Aura. I tell you, Sir; you must, before I dare give Credit to you serve me faithfully at least two whole Years together, and then if we like one another as well as we do now—Why we'll settle our Fortunes and our Inclinations.

Mode. And jog in the Road of our Fathers.

Aura. Amen!

Mode. So be it. (5. 2, p. 91.)

[24] See quotation above.

Modely remains lewd above four and three-quarter acts. Towards the end he apparently quits his jaunty rakishness and cynicism, only to resume them when Aura begins playing on those keys. It should be remembered, of course, that he must of necessity appear contrite, for Freehold threatens to unleash his mastiff upon him. Furthermore, Modely still has a strong desire for the person of Aura, and he is forced to marry her, since, as he says, "I can have you no other way." Even Freehold perceives that Modely is still very much the roué. "I don't think you tame enough to be married," he observes.

4

The pathetic plight of a wronged wife [25] or a cast mistress was Johnson's favorite theme. He seems to have been genuinely touched by the plight of a maltreated wife or a deceived mistress; there are no fewer than six such heroines in his plays.[26] But heretofore he had not thought it advisable to treat this *motif* by itself without some subject of lesser sentimental hue. Johnson was no pioneering idealist; he was waiting for someone to popularize bourgeois tragedy. A year after George Lillo had blazed the path for the new genre with his success *The London Merchant*, Johnson brought out his tragedy, *Caelia*, which also proved to be his last play. Produced on December 12, 1732, by a cast of neophytes,[27] the tragedy was a complete failure. The records point to only two performances, which means that the author received no benefit.

[25] Cf. the declaration of independence pronounced by Cynthia in Johnson's successful comedy *The Wife's Relief* (1711). She is speaking to her apparently unreclaimable husband, Riot: "I have stooped below the Earth to show my Duty—but thus, trampled on, I arise to tell the World I am a Woman, a Wife, an *English* free-born Wife." Johnson never missed an opportunity of putting in a good word for women and of deprecating man's cruelty to them. In the early eighteenth century there was no more ardent feminist than Charles Johnson.

[26] Johnson's feminism was doubtless prompted in part by the growing importance of women in the eighteenth century. He must have known that success in the theatre depended in a large measure on feminine approval. Yet this cannot be the whole explanation, for his unflaggingly spirited defense of "the gentle Fair" bears the unmistakable imprint of sincerity.

[27] The principal rôles were sustained by such histrionic nondescripts as W. Mills, Hallam, Berry, and Mrs. Shireburn. Most of the Drury-Lane stars of the early eighteenth century were no longer on the stage: Pinkethman died in 1725, Mrs. Oldfield in 1730, Wilks in 1732, and Bullock and Booth in 1733. Colley Cibber retired in 1733, though he occasionally reappeared for special performances.

Johnson attributes the failure of his tragedy to the over-realistic scenes involving a bawd and her females, introduced to "raise the Distress" of the pathetic heroine. The moral standards of London were becoming fastidious, indeed. I quote from the Advertisement to the Octavo of 1733, the only edition:

I had the Mortification to see this Play acted the first Night, and to hear the Characters of Mother *Lupine* and her Women disapproved by several of the Audience, who, as if they thought themselves in bad Company, were very severe. However necessary it was to show the Manners of these People in order to raise the Distress of Caelia and to heighten her Character, and whatever Care I took that nothing indecent shou'd be said, I must confess it was an Error to let them appear at all. I had the Pleasure, however, to see the serious Scenes applauded, and to hear some of these very Spectators, who were offended at the lower Characters, join with *Caelia* in her Tears.

The playwright goes on to express his moral purpose. The play has a definite lesson to teach; the theatre was already becoming an auxillary of the church:

I beg leave to say, a Moral of this kind, and which has not, in my Memory, been set in so full a Light by Dramatick Authors, might have been of Use and Instruction. How many Families have suffer'd irreparable Injuries of this Sort? yet it is look'd upon by many as a *fashionable Amusement* rather than the highest injustice: If these Scenes shall have any Effect on the Morals of our Youth, and prove a Caution to the Young and Innocent of the Fair Sex, I shall think my self well rewarded.

Johnson was the immediate successor of George Lillo in domestic tragedy; and his play is an advance on the pioneer in the genre. Professor Bernbaum has this to say of *Caelia*:

Its central situation is one that, even more than the ruin of a promising young man like Barnwell, naturally excites pity,—the seduction of an innocent maiden, A pathetic figure of this sort had already been sketched in Farquhar's sentimental comedy, *The Twin Rivals*; but the distresses into which Johnson plunged his heroine were of a magnitude unprecedented in the drama of sensibility, and were boldly carried to a fatal issue. They were comparable to those which had been briefly narrated in the tragic *Tatler* and *Spectator* tales that recorded the desperate fortunes of victims of libertinism. To arouse compassion for a typical case

of that sort was Johnson's aim; and with some justice he opined that the particular kind of immorality attacked by him had not "been set in so full a light by the dramatick writers."[28]

Caelia is a fifth-act tragedy; when the curtain rises two months have already elapsed since the heroine had been betrayed and taken to London by the libertine, Wronglove. In the first scene, Meanwell, a steward, relates the misfortunes of his young mistress to Bellamy, a fine, upright gentleman despite his association with Wronglove. We learn that the girl is enceinte and that her mother has died of grief. Subsequently Wronglove puts Caelia into the hands of Mrs. Lupine, "the Abbess of a Nunnery,"[29] so that he might marry "a vast Fortune." When Lupine's establishment is raided, Caelia is committed to the house of correction. Her father arrives too late to save the broken-hearted girl, and she dies in his arms; but before she expires word comes that Wronglove has been killed in a duel.

The first thing that strikes the reader of the play is its resemblance to *Clarissa Harlowe*. "We are presented here with characters," writes Professor Nicoll, "destined to become typical: Wronglove, a kind of Lovelace; Bellamy, the virtuous male friend; and Caelia, a species of Clarissa Harlowe, the afflicted heroine."[30]

The *raisonneur*, Bellamy, states the thesis of the tragedy in Scene One:

Meanwell. But he [Wronglove] must marry her; common Honesty will oblige him to do it, if he wou'd not be thought the most dishonourable Man that ever breath'd; without Gratitude, Affection, Truth, or any Tie of Nature or Humanity.

Bellamy. I will tell thee, honest *Meanwell*, there is not one Thing above Ground so devoid of any sense of Shame or Vertue as a young Whoremaster. . . . I know not how it comes to be so, but this Practice of ruining innocent young Girls, is look'd on only as a Piece of Gallantry—as part of a Gentleman's Accomplishment. I think as

[28] *The Drama of Sensibility* (Cambridge, Mass., 1925), pp. 158-9.

[29] Professor Bernbaum comments as follows on the "low" characters: "This introduction of the comic into domestic tragedy is exceptional, if not unique." (*Op. cit.*, p. 162.)

[30] *Early Eighteenth Century Drama*, p. 122.

thou dost—'tis base and unjust. It must be so, as the Injury is great and irreparable.[31]

When Wronglove and Bellamy meet there follows an interesting debate between two irreconcilable points of view—those of a Horner and a Bevil:

Bell. Did you ever give your self Time to think of Right and Wrong; or how far Honour shou'd be concern'd in every Action of the Man who stiles him self a Gentleman?

Wrong. Why, to deal freely with you: as to true Honour, I hope I am as capable of deviating from its Rules as any he who pretends most to it. . . . But in some cases our Notions of Honour may differ.

Bell. Then according to thine own Notion . . . what is Honour?

Wrong. Why it is or ought to be the Characteristicks of a Gentleman.

Bell. In what does it consist?

Wrong. In Generosity, Integrity . . . in binding one self on all Occasions to do what is Right.

Bell. Then 'tis only another Name for Conscience.

Wrong. True, a Man of Honour cannot knowingly do a Wrong.

Bell. Then you think a Man of Honour cannot break his Faith, be unjust or cruel?

Wrong. No, certainly—But to what do these Moral Queries tend, old *Solon?*

Bell. Did you ever tell *Caelia* you loved her?

Wrong. Ten Thousand Times.

Bell. And promised to marry her?

Wrong. Ay, ay, that's a Thing of course always in these Cases.

Bell. Then you engaged as a Man of Honour—

Wrong. Ah, very pleasant . . . in love Affairs. . . .

Bell. Are Women then excluded from all Moral Right and Justice? Have you a Title to do the greatest Injury and not the least? If it be not so, you are by your own Conscience, faithless, unjust, cruel.[32]

The debate between the profligate and the generous virtuous gentleman is resumed in Act 4. In the interim Wronglove has

[31] *The Tragedy of Caelia; or, The Perjur'd Lover.* London, 1733. 1. 1, pp. 3-4. Cf. the speeches of Freehold in *The Country Lasses*, above.

[32] 2. 1, pp. 14-16. Wronglove must be a dull-witted spark if he fails to perceive the conclusion to which Bellamy's Socratic questioning is leading him.

heartlessly consigned Caelia to a life of shame. Bellamy accosts Wronglove when the latter is about to marry an heiress and proceeds to reprove him. The roué flies off the handle:

Wrong. Sir, this is not to be borne. I will not be answerable to you for my Behaviour.

Bell. But you must, Sir, be answerable to me; to me and all Mankind; this is a Crime against Society—brutal and barbarous Action. But I will tell you, Sir, what has provoked me to this Warmth. It was a Sight that surely would have melted any Heart that could be sensible to Pity. Not an Hour is past since *Caelia*, the poor, unhappy, suffering, was seen bearing your Burden your unborn Infant, into a Prison, the lowest, vilest, Prison, a House appointed to the Chastisement of the lewd and criminal Women, and accompany'd by such. There she must perish. . . . Does not this concern you? Does it not concern me? Does it not concern Humanity? (4. 2, p. 50.)

Johnson makes sure that the moral will not be missed. After the death of the heroine, Meanwell delivers the closing speech and verse-tag:

Alas! poor Lady! The Tumult of her Soul is done. Honour and Pain, Reproach and Anxiety and Shame are fled together. Blush, blush, ye Libertines; survey this dreadful Scene of Woe; and ask your Hearts if poor unhappy *Caelia* deserv'd this Usage from the Man she lov'd. Could you but feel a Father's Grief, would you not think him wrong'd? He who pleads Custom, vicious Custom, for Crimes like these, renounces all Pretentions to Justice or Humanity—

> Then let this Story teach unbridled Youth,
> Honour can only be secur'd by Truth.

Caelia is Johnson's most successful character. In delineating the woes of his heroine, he has come very close to accomplishing what other sentimental dramatists have failed to do, that is, in most of the scenes depicting Caelia's distress the reader feels a genuine pity for her. Above all, she is a three-dimensional figure, whose love and pain and anguish are real. Her pleas to Wronglove are moving and dramatically effective. In Act 1, for example, she begs him not to forsake her:

I am your Child, your Ward, your Care, your Trust; I have no Father, Mother, Friends, Relatives—none but you. You are my Comfort and Support . . . when you leave me I and my Child

must perish. O blame not me if I complain to you; and when I see you treat me so coldly, almost with Indifference, to whom can I complain? I have relinquished all for you and am by all deserted. . . . My Fame, my Character, my once unspotted Reputation's gone; no vertuous Woman will admit me to her Fellowship. *Wrong-love*, I am your Slave; do not be too hard a Master.

Like Richardson's Lovelace, Wronglove is thoroughly unconvincing. The reason for this is that both the dramatist and the novelist were completely out of sympathy with their rakes; neither Johnson nor Richardson was interested in presenting the libertine's point of view with some degree of convincingness. Johnson especially makes it clear that he has a lesson to inculcate and a moral to point; Wronglove is the arch-villain in the tragic end of an innocent girl. As the tragedy unfolds, he loses all semblance of humanity and becomes a symbol of profligacy. Even the coarse, callous Lupine is moved by Caelia's touching farewell appeal to her lover. "It brings Tears into my Eyes," says the bawd, "'Tis a poor, dear Affectionate little Pullet . . . and that Dog is all Rocks; he has a Millstone in the middle of his Breast." Caelia's departure leaves Wronglove unmoved and even relieved. "Now the Burden is off my Shoulders," he comments, "I am somewhat easier than I was. . . . These virtuous Girls plague a man . . . she is so fond of breeding; and I am so cold and yawning and indifferent and sick and surfeited. . . . One may be tired even of Pleasure, as *Congreve* says." [33]

Bellamy, the virtuous friend, is also devoid of individuality. Like Wronglove, he is a talking principle, a type of conduct rather than a person; and he is obviously the mouthpiece through which Johnson can inveigh against the Wrongloves of London.

The presence of the "low" characters, it will be recalled, was chiefly responsible for the failure of *Caelia*, but that their inclusion was justified dramatically cannot be denied; the heroine's brief sojourn among them undoubtedly heightens her distress. Especially effective is the scene in which the strumpets taunt the uninitiated Caelia. When one remembers that these prostitutes have become what they are by dint of such

[33] I. 2, p. 12.

betrayals as Wronglove's it will be understood why Johnson insisted that the Lupine scenes be retained.[34] Unfortunately, he fell foul of a growing moral fastidiousness.

Caelia is a significant contribution to bourgeois tragedy; it is unquestionably among the most important and the most successful examples of the genre in the first half of the eighteenth century; and it is to be regretted that after its failure, Johnson turned away from the theatre. Had he continued—he was only fifty-three at his retirement—he might have gone on to make an even greater contribution to domestic tragedy. Professor Bernbaum sums up Johnson's achievement very succinctly:

> The play was a fair and forceful portrayal of the darkest social evil, and Johnson's Sir Friendly Moral pointedly asked: "Does it not concern humanity?" The sincerity of his purpose deserved applause, as did his skillful conduct of the action and the natural yet dignified style of his dialogue. Nor was the audience that attended the first performance of *Caelia* insensible to its merits and unmoved by its poignancy. . . . But just appreciation for the work as a whole was lost in the disgust aroused by the realism of the episodes in which Mrs. Lupine and her lewd company were satirized. . . . He paid the penalty for his boldness. His tragedy was performed only two nights, and he never produced another play. His withdrawal was a great loss to the drama of sensibility; for that very desire "to raise the distress" . . . was an instinct in the right direction.[35]

[34] Booth had advised deletion. (See Advertisement to the Reader.)

[35] *The Drama of Sensibility*, p. 162. The Epilogue to the tragedy was written by Fielding; it is a cynical commentary on the tragic distress of the play:

> Lud! what a Fuss is here! What Blood and Slaughter!
> Because poor Miss has prov'd her Mother's Daughter.
> This unknown Bard is some insipid Beast,
> From *Cornwall*, or *Northumberland* at least;
> Where if a Virgin chance to step aside,
> And taste forbidden Sweetness of a Bride,
> The virtuous Ladies, like Infection, fly her,
> But here, 'mongst us so famous for Good-nature,
> Who thinks a Cuckold quite a Fellow-creature,
> Where Miss may take great Liberties upon her,
> And have her Man, and yet may keep her Honour:
> Here does the Wretch his stupid Muse invoke,
> And turn to solemn Tragedy—a Joke!
> Had some Town Bard this Subject undertaken,
> He wou'd have match'd, not kill'd, the Nymph forsaken.

5

In the foregoing pages I have tried to show how three aspects of eighteenth century drama are graphically illustrated in the plays of a representative playwright like Johnson. But Johnson wrote every type of play; I am convinced that it would be equally instructive to study his *modus operandi* in the political satire, or adaptation of Shakespeare,[36] or translation from

> *Wronglove*, as now, had the first Favour carried,
> And *Bellamy*, been what he is fit for, married—
> What else are all your Comic Heroes fam'd for,
> Than such Exploits as *Wronglove* has been blam'd for?
> The Girl was in the Fault, who strove to smother
> That Case she shou'd have open'd to her Mother;
> All had been hush'd by the old Lady's Skill,
> And *Caelia* prov'd a good Town-Virgin still;
> For as each Man is brave, till put to Rout,
> So is each Woman virtuous, till found out:
> Which Ladies, here I make my hasty Prayer,
> May never be the Case of any Fair,
> Who takes unhappy *Caelia* to her Care.

Fielding is probably more ironical than cynical here; we know that he was favorably disposed to bourgeois tragedy. Professor Nicoll observes that "the domestic tragedy of the more extreme sort seems to have been heavily patronised by Fielding. He supported Lillo; and a glance at the repertoires . . . will show how often domestic tragedies were acted at the Haymarket during the time of his direction at that theatre." (*Early Eighteenth Century Drama*, p. 124, n. 1). *Caelia* was produced anonymously; hence the reference to "this unknown Bard."

[36] Johnson's "improvement" of *As You Like It*, entitled *Love in a Forest*, was produced in 1723. The Prologue is typical of the period's attitude toward Shakespeare: The Bard was certainly a great genius, but he lived and wrought in a somewhat barbarous age. The Augustans believed with Johnson that Shakespeare's "immortal Lyre" was definitely in need of tuning; and though they paid him lip-service, the Cibbers and the Johnsons and the Hills went blithely ahead butchering Shakespeare in an attempt to make a Drury-Lane hit. The Prologue in part follows:

> In Honour to his Name and his learn'd Age,
> Once more your much lov'd *Shakespeare* treads the Stage.
> Another Work from that great Hand appears,
> His Ore's refin'd, but not impair'd, by Years.
> Those Sacred Truths our Sages coldly tell
> In languid Prose, as he describes we feel.
> He looks all Nature thro'; strikes at a Heat
> Her various Forms irregularly great.
> See the Dictator by the Patriot slain,
> And the World's mighty Victor bleed again;
> His *Romans* speak and act like *Romans* all,
> We hear them thunder in the Capitol:

French [37] classical tragedy. Johnson's pieces also shed considerable light upon the period in general. The rising bourge-

> Quick *Cassius* raves, and *Brutus*, sternly good,
> Pierces the Father's in the Tyrant's Blood.
> . . . . . .
> The Hero, Courtier, Patriot, and the Man,
> Form in one Character, his pious *Dane*.
> . . . . . .
> If into lower Life his Pencil strays,
> Superior still, the Comic Force survives
> In *Falstaff*, *Shallow* and the Merry Wives.
> Now,—As you like it, judge the following Play,
> And when you view this Work retriev'd to Day:
> Forgive our Modern Author's Honest Zeal,
> He hath attempted boldly if not well:
> Believe, he only does with Pain and Care,
> Presume to weed the beautiful Parterre.
> His whole Ambition does at most aspire
> To tune the Sacred Bard's immortal Lyre;
> The Scene from Time and Error to restore,
> And give the Stage, from *Shakespeare* one Play more.

Johnson gives the banished Duke the name of Alberto; and Jaques, son to Sir Rowland de Boys, becomes Roberto. Charles is no longer a wrestler, but Master of Duke Frederick's fencing academy. The unities also dictated the elimination of Touchstone, Martext, Corin, William, Phoebe, and Audrey; Sylvius is retained but he speaks only a few lines. To compensate, Johnson drags in the "base mechanicals" of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* to give a special performance of "Pyramus and Thisby" in the Forest of Arden. Since *As You Like It* is a comedy, there can be no strict application of the rules. Yet their influence is discernible. In the first place, the adapter is at all times concerned with integrating his somewhat sprawling original; hence the elimination of no fewer than seven characters. Thus, he adds the comic crew of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*; but this addition is not really detrimental to the unity of the action, for the mechanicals appear but once, their performance serving at a time-filler during which Rosalind is given a chance to don feminine garb. Second, the doctrine of decorum can be seen at work in the verbal alterations, and especially in the change of the wrestling match to a fencing tourney. Finally, the adapter occasionally inserts passages affirming poetic justice.

Professor Odell calls *Love in a Forest* "a step forward. The revival showed at least a dainty side of Shakespeare's genius hitherto neglected." (*Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving* 1. 247.) But if the play's the thing, the adaptation must be adjudged a miserable perversion. The total effect is that of a cento of quotations, hopelessly garbled and insipidly put together. What can be more absurd than a trial by combat in the pastoral *milieu* of *As You Like It*, or transforming melancholy Jaques into a lover, "sighing like furnace" and ready to indite "a woeful ballad made to his mistress' eyebrow?" Fortunately, this contemptible farrago has never been permitted to profane the original by reappearing on the boards after its initial run. (It should be noted that in making Jaques enamoured of Celia, Johnson anticipates George Sand's version, *Comme Il Vous Plaira*.)

Johnson also made considerable use of *Much Ado* in his political farce, *The Cobler of Preston*.

[37] Racine's *Iphigénie* and *Bajazet* were translated and adapted under the titles of

oisie with its characteristic middle-class morality, expanding trade, the growing importance of the periodical and the mushroomic newspaper, the increasing respect for women,—these and other unmistakable marks of eighteenth-century civilization loom larger and clearer when seen through the eyes of a man-about-town, who hobnobbed with Robert Wilks and had his regularly appointed niche at Button's. Studies of other such minor figures may uncover little, if any, of literary value but will add appreciably to our knowledge and understanding of the period.

University of Wisconsin.

The Victim and *The Sultaness* respectively. Johnson also went to Molière, Lesage, and Dancourt for plots and characters.

MUSICAL SETTINGS OF PRIOR'S LYRICS IN THE 18TH CENTURY

By Majl Ewing

"No other poet between Dryden and Burns was honored by having so many of his poems set to music," says Charles Kenneth Eves in his recent study of Prior.[1] Prior's lyrics, smoothly and elegantly turned, lent themselves admirably to the new type of musical setting that had become fashionable by 1700. The new songs, in contrast to the unaccompanied Elizabethan songs sung in parts, had heavy instrumental accompaniment and were intended primarily for professional entertainment.

After 1660 the popular cultivation of music declined. "As greater skill and refinement in singing and greater instrumental execution were introduced, ordinary performances were less and less in favor; and we hear less of everyone being expected to take part, or of mechanics singing together."[2] The popularity of Italian opera and the establishment of concert rooms and social gathering places like Vauxhall, Ranelagh, and Marylebone Gardens where songs were sung by professional singers turned composers to the Italian style. "The ancient pride of the English in the superiority of their music had now melted, as far as vocal music was concerned, before the splendor of the Italian achievements . . ."[3] "With that curious partiality for the musical traditions of any nation but its own that the English public has so often shown, the music purveyors of the time of Handel turned to Italy for something fresh," says Ernest Walker in his *History of Music in England*.[4]

Folk tunes and popular melodies were looked down upon by the educated. Dr. Burney calls them "wild, rude, and often vulgar" and writes contemptuously of *The Beggars' Opera*, the lyrics of which were set to popular melodies by Dr. Johann

[1] *Matthew Prior, Poet and Diplomatist* (New York, 1939), p. 219.

[2] Henry Davey, *History of English Music* (2nd edition revised, London, n. d.), p. 293.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 260.

[4] 2nd ed., London, 1924, p. 183.

Christopher Pepusch: [5] "for though not a single new air was composed for this pasticcio in our vulgar tongue, it has proved the best opera to the patentees of our playhouses that ever was brought on the stage. The morality and the music are equally intelligible and acceptable to the galleries; and a favorite singer can always fill the rest of the house." [6]

The musical settings of Prior's lyrics which I have collected show scarcely a trace of ballad style and popular melody. The influence upon their composers is the sophisticated Italian style.

There are two principal collections of Prior's songs: *Lyric Poems;/ Being Twenty Four Songs/* (Never Before Printed:) by the Late/ Matthew Prior Esq[r]/ Set to Music/ by Several Eminent Masters./ [Medallion portrait of Prior]/ Printed for & Sold by / Sam: Harding,/ On the Pavement in St. Martins-Lane./ MDCXLI / Published Jan—ry 1st 1740/1. *Eighteen Canzonets/ for / Two, and three Voices;/* (The Words chiefly by Matthew Prior Esq[r]) / Set to Music by/ John Travers/ Organist of his Majesty's Chapel Royal/ and of St. Paul Covent Garden./ [double rule] London Printed for the Author by John Simpson/ at the Base Viol and Flute in Sweeting's Alley opposite the East/ Door of the Royal Exchange. [1745?]

Only two copies of *Lyric Poems* are known to exist, one in the British Museum, the other in the library of St. John's College, Cambridge. It is a handsome small folio volume printed from beautifully engraved copper plates. The several eminent masters who composed settings for the twenty-four lyrics were Willem Defesch, John Christopher Smith, Mr. C. R., and Mr. * * *. They set twelve, eight, two, and two respectively. Each setting gave the melody and the *basso continuo* or 'thorough-bass' for harpsichord accompaniment. The *basso continuo* added greatly to the artistic possibilities of the solo, for the primary office of accompaniments was not to supply further independent melody but to declare the chord-foundation that the melody implied.[7]

Eighteen Canzonets for Two and three Voices "enjoyed a long career of popularity, and two [of them]—'Haste, my

[5] It is interesting to note that Pepusch, a Prussian born in Berlin in 1667 who came to England about 1700, did more than any Englishman to keep alive English music of the 16th and 17th centuries. In 1710 he founded the Society for the Study of Old Composers. He disliked the prevalent Italian style.

[6] *A General History of Music* (London, 1789), 4. 650.

[7] Waldo Seldon Pratt, *The History of Music* (New York, n. d.), p. 161.

Nannette' and 'I, my dear, was born today' are still occasionally heard."[8] Eleven of the eighteen lyrics were by Prior. These settings were composed in canon and have the *basso continuo* for harpsichord accompaniment.

These are the two principal collections, but many more of Prior's lyrics were set to music and were published as single sheets or in magazines or song collections. Those lyrics for which I have found musical settings are here arranged alphabetically by first lines. Under each is given the composer and the data of publication.

1. Accept, my love, as true a heart
   John Christopher Smith,[9] *Lyric Poems*
2. Alexis shun'd his Fellow Swains
   ——— Gouge,[10] single sheet folio, London, 1720?
   Reprinted in *The Musical Miscellany* (London, 1729), 2.14.
   Another setting, anonymous, single sheet folio, London, 1730?
3. As after Noon, one Summer's Day
   Anonymous setting, *The Musical Miscellany* (London, 1729), 2.158.
   Reprinted in *The Merry Musician* (London, 1730), 2.60.
4. As Cloe came into the Room t'other Day

[8] Grove (1940 ed.), 5.374-5.

[9] 1712-1795. Born at Anspach, he became the pupil, amanuensis, and friend of Handel. He also studied under Dr. Pepusch. As early as 1732 he began to produce operas. In 1754 he composed the music for *The Fairies*, Garrick's adaptation of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and in 1756 the music for Garrick's adaptation of *The Tempest*. His settings of Shakespeare's lyrics in these plays were long popular. He produced an oratorio based on *Paradise Lost* in 1758 and carried on Handel's oratorios until 1774. Handel willed him his manuscript scores and harpsichord, which Smith presented to George III, from whom they came to the British Museum.*

* The Notes on the musicians have been compiled from many sources: Hawkins, Burney, Grove, Eitner (*Quellen-Lexikon der Musiker*), Pulver (*Biographical Dictionary of Old English Music*), *Dictionary of National Biography*, *The Gentleman's Magazine*, and handbooks such as those by Ernest Walker, Henry Davey, W. S. Pratt.

[10] First name unknown, an English musician at the beginning of the 18th century. He may be the same person as the actor Mr. Gouge who appeared in a farce, *Women Will Have Their Wills*, in 1700. Seven songs by Gouge are in *The Musical Miscellany*, Vol. I, and the Catalogue of Printed Music (1487-1800) in the British Museum lists five single sheet songs published between 1700 and 1730?

Mr. Larken,[11] *The Gentleman's Magazine* 18 (April 1748). 181.

5. Beneath a verdant Lawrel's ample Shade
   Johann Ernst Galliard,[12] *Six English Cantatas* after the Italian Manner (London, 1725).

6. Cease, Leonora, cease to mourn
   John Travers,[13] *Eighteen Canzonets*, no. 9.
   J. Mathews,[14] 'A Favorite Duet,' single sheet folio, Bath, 1800?

7. Chloe beauty has and wit
   C. R.,[15] *Lyric Poems*

8. Come, weep no more, for 'tis in vain
   John Christopher Smith, *Lyric Poems*

9. Dear Chloe, how blubber'd is that pretty Face
   Anonymous setting, *The Royal Magazine* 17 (1767). 41. Reprinted in *The Universal Magazine* 41 (1767). 39, and also as a single sheet folio, London, 1780?

10. Fair Sylvia, cease to blame my Youth
    Alexander Damascene,[16] *The Banquet of Music* (London, 1690), 4. 4.

[11] I have not been able to identify Mr. Larken. The Catalogue of Printed Music in the British Museum lists five songs by him, including this one.

[12] Oboeist and organist, teacher of music in the royal family under Queen Anne. He was born at Zell about 1687 and came to England in 1706. From 1717 on, he was employed by John Rich to compose music for Rich's pantomimes and masques. In 1728 he set 'The Morning Hymn of Adam and Eve' from *Paradise Lost*. The famous hunting song 'With early horn,' has kept his name alive. He translated Tosi's *Observations on the Florid Song* in 1742 and died in 1749.

[13] 1703?-1758. While a chorister at St. George's Chapel, Windsor, he attracted the attention of Dr. Godolphin, Dean of St. Paul's and Provost of Eton, by whom he was placed as an articled pupil with Maurice Greene. He was further assisted to great advantage in his studies by Dr. Pepusch. About 1725 he became organist of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, and in 1737 of the Chapel Royal. He was principally a composer of church music, but his charming songs have kept him from oblivion. Dr. Pepusch left him half of his fine library.

[14] J. Mathews was a music publisher and music seller at 3 George Street, Bath. Between 1794 and 1800 he wrote and published glees and songs in single sheets. The Catalogue of Printed Music lists six other pieces by him. This song was published without the composer's name but with the information that it was "by the author of 'The Pleasures of Spring.'"

[15] The identity of this composer has eluded me. The initials are not listed in Quellen-Lexikon or the Catalogue of Printed Music, nor do they fit any one in this period in the musical dictionaries.

[17] A Fleming, organist of the Church of Notre Dame at Antwerp and in 1725

Anonymous setting, *The London Magazine* 14 (September 1745). 458-59. Also issued as single sheet octavo, London, 1745.

11. Farewel, Amynta, we must part
Willem Defesch,[17] *Lyric Poems*

12. Haste, my Nanette, my lovely maid
John Travers, *Eighteen Canzonets*, no. 12.
Reprinted as a single sheet for Bland and Weller, London, 1795.

13. I my dear, was born today
John Travers, *Eighteen Canzonets*, no. 5.
Reprinted as a single sheet for J. Bland, London, 1780.

14. If Wine and Musick have the Pow'r
John Eccles,[18] *The Monthly Mask of Vocal Music* (London, 1703), p. 29.

the Court Music from July 8, 1689, until his death in 1719. His secular songs were published in many contemporary publications: *The Theatre of Music*, 1685, *Comes Amoris*, 1687, *The Banquet of Music*, 1690. I am indebted to Day and Murrie, *English Song-Books, 1651-1702* for this setting.

[17] A Fleming, organist of the Church of Notre Dame at Antwerp and in 1725 *maitre de chapelle*. Upon his dismissal in 1731 for mistreatment of a choir boy, he settled in England. In 1735 he produced his oratorio *Judith*, and in 1745 another, *Joseph*. An able violinist, he led the band in the first performance of Handel's *Occasional Oratorio*, February 12, 1746. He was a voluminous composer, writing sets of sonatas and concertos for stringed and other instruments, collections of canzonets and airs, and many single songs. Burney (4. 672) says he was a good contrapuntist but that his productions were generally dry and uninteresting. This judgment would certainly not hold for the twelve settings he wrote to Prior's poems, for these are free from virtuoso traits and have sweet melodies. An engraved portrait of Defesch was made in London, 1757. The date of his death is uncertain, probably 1758.

[18] Born in 1650 or earlier, he was the son and pupil of Solomon Eccles (1618-83) the musician who burned his music books and instruments on becoming a Quaker in 1660. John Eccles was one of the most popular song writers of the time, songs by him appearing in at least forty-six plays. That he was well thought of as a musician is shown by his collaboration with Purcell on the third act of *Don Quixote*. He set Congreve's 'St. Cecilia's Day Ode' for 1701 and the song, 'Love's but a frailty of the Mind' in *The Way of the World*. He became musician in ordinary to the Court in 1697 with a salary of £40 and Master of the King's Music in 1700 at £200 a year. In 1701 he published *Songs for One, Two, and Three Voices*. He is often represented in collections of vocal and instrumental music of this period, thirty-one of his songs appearing in *Pills to Purge Melancholy*. His songs, says Pulver in *A Biographical Dictionary of Old English Music*, "are marked by ease, vigour, and a certain charm of a roguish kind." He died in 1735.

Reprinted in *A Collection of Songs for One, Two, and Three Voices* (London, 1704), p. 59.[19]

15. In vain, alas! poor Strephon tries
William Defesch, *Lyric Poems*

16. In vain You tell your parting Lover
Anonymous setting, *Mercurius Musicus* (London, 1700), pp. 20-1.
Anonymous setting, single sheet folio, London, 1730?
Francisco Geminiani,[20] 'The Tender Lover,' single sheet folio, London, 1750?
Reprinted in Arne's *Monthly Melody* (London, 1760), and in the *Hibernian Magazine* (Dublin, September 1787).
William Jackson,[21] *Twelve Songs* Opus 1, no. 5 (London, 1755).
Andreas Lidel,[22] single sheet folio, London, 1780?

[19] I am indebted for this reference to Eves, f. n., p. 182.

[20] Born at Lucca in 1667, he came to London in 1714. An eminent violinist, the pupil of Scarlatti and Corelli, he played his concertos with Handel at the English Court in 1715. He continued to give concerts and composed a great number of solos, trios, and concertos for the violin. But he devoted much time to writing treatises on the art of playing various kinds of musical instruments, and in 1740 published *The Art of Playing the Violin*, the first book of its kind published in England. Violin playing was in its infancy in England, and Geminiani by his compositions and instruction extended the technical range of performance on the violin. He lived for long periods in Paris and Dublin, where he died in 1762. The Catalogue of Printed Music lists seven of his songs.

[21] 1730-1803. Born at Exeter, Jackson, on showing a predilection for music, was placed under J. Silvester, organist of the Cathedral. In 1748 he went to London to study with John Travers. In 1755 he published *Twelve Songs* which became very popular. He published voluminously in the succeeding years and was placed among the first composers of the period. Twelve was a favorite group number with him. He issued three more sets of *Twelve Songs*, a book of *Twelve Hymns*, and *Twelve Canzonets* for two voices, one of which—'Time has not thinned my flowing hair'—was a favorite concert piece down into the 19th century. He composed settings for 'Lycidas,' Warton's 'Ode to Fancy,' and Pope's 'Dying Christian to his soul.' The success of General Burgoyne's opera, *The Lord of the Manor*, may be partly attributed to Jackson's pleasant music. In 1777 he was appointed organist of Exeter Cathedral, a post he held the rest of his life. As he grew old, he grew cantankerous, finding fault with everything and everybody in *Observations on the Present State of Music in London* (1791). His circle of friends included the Sheridans, Samuel Rogers, Wolcot, and Gainsborough, whose landscape style he successfully imitated in his own paintings. Although he wrote much church music, it is tame. His gift was for song-setting.

[22] The name is often spelt Lidl. Born in Vienna about 1740, he came to London in 1778 and died ten or eleven years later. He was a celebrated player of the

Dominico Corri,[23] 'The New Tender Lover' a Ballad, double sheet folio, London, 1790?

17. Is it, O Love, thy want of eyes
Willem Defesch, *Lyric Poems*

18. Let Perjur'd fair Aminta Know
Willem Defesch, *Lyric Poems*

19. Love has often threaten'd war
Mr. K.,[24] *A Second Booke of Songs* (London, 1698?), pp. 29-30.

20. Love I confess I thought Thee but a Name
Messrs. Pickering and Tudway[25]

21. Love! inform thy faithful creature
Willem Defesch, *Lyric Poems*

22. Morella, charming without art
Willem Defesch, *Lyric Poems*

23. Nanny blushes when I woo her
Willem Defesch, *Lyric Poems*

baryton (a viol de gamba with metal sympathetic strings). Burney (4. 679) says, "M. Lidl played with exquisite taste and expression upon this ungrateful instrument. . . ." A composer of quintets, quartets, trios, and duos, he is known to have composed only this one song.

[23] Born in Rome in 1746, he became a singing master in Edinburgh in 1771 and later, about 1780, a music publisher in partnership with his brother Natale. Having formed some theatrical connections, he moved to 67 Dean Street, London, in 1790. He wrote a large number of songs, sonatas, rondos and two operas, both of which were successful. He died in 1825.

[24] This is Robert King (see below, 49: Whilst I am scorch'd with hot Desire). Day and Murrie list this song.

[25] I have been unable to find any reference to Pickering. Thomas Tudway, 1646?-1726, began his musical career as a chorister of the Chapel Royal. In 1670 he became organist of King's College Chapel, Cambridge, and held other university appointments. In 1705 he became Professor of Music and Mus. Doc., but the next year he was degraded from his degrees and appointments for punning on the Duke of Somerset's limited bestowal of patronage among the members of the university. Upon making a public apology he was reinstated in his degrees and appointments. In 1714 Lord Harley, Prior's friend and patron, commissioned him to make a collection of English cathedral music from the 16th and 17th centuries. This six volume manuscript collection was copied and scored from the choir books at Ely, Durham, Wells, Exeter, York, and other cathedrals and passed to the British Museum with the Harleian manuscripts. Tudway composed a service for the consecration on August 31, 1721, of Lord Harley's private chapel at Wimpole. Prior was probably present as he spent the summer at Wimpole where he died September 18 of that year. Tudway wrote many catches and songs printed in the collections of the period. I have found no copy of the music to this song but the poem in the Longleat manuscripts is headed 'Song set by Messrs. Pickering and Tudway.'

24. Once I was unconfin'd and free
John Christopher Smith, *Lyric Poems*

25. Phillis, give this humour over
C. R., *Lyric Poems*

26. Phillis, since we have both been kind
John Christopher Smith, *Lyric Poems*

27. Phillis, this pious talk give o'er
Willem Defesch, *Lyric Poems*

28. Poor Hall caught his death standing under a spout
John Travers, *Eighteen Canzonets*, no. 10.

29. Reading ends in melancholy
John Abell,[26] *A Collection of Songs in Several Languages* (London, 1701), pp. 7-8.
John Travers, *Eighteen Canzonets*, no. 11.

30. Says Pontius in a rage, contradicting his Wife
John Travers, *Eighteen Canzonets*, No. 7.
Reprinted in *Apollonian Harmony* (London, 1790?), 4. 14, and in *The Lady's Magazine* (March 1792).
Reprinted as a single sheet for J. Bland, London, 1780?

31. See, whilst Thou weep'st, fair Cloe, see
Anonymous setting ('Music by a Lady'), *The Lady's Magazine* (May 1797).
Reprinted in the October issue, 1797.

32. Since by ill fate I'm forc'd away
Willem Defesch, *Lyric Poems*

33. Since, Maggy, I mun bid adieu
Anonymous setting (Mr. ***), *Lyric Poems*

[26] c. 1650-1724, the celebrated alto singer and lutenist, who enjoyed the favor of Charles II and James II. This lyric was first published in *Miscellaneous Works* (London, 1740), by Prior's executor, Adrian Drift, where it is headed "A Song set by Mr. Abel." After the revolution of 1688 Abell, who was a Catholic, roamed the continent. "The harmonious vagabond" was welcomed in France, Germany, Poland, and Holland where he was at Loo in October, 1695, for the rejoicings on the taking of Namur. By 1700 he was again in England, for Congreve mentions him in a letter dated December 10, 1700—"He certainly sings beyond all creatures on earth." He published besides some individual pieces three collections: *A Collection of Songs in Several Languages*, 1700, *A Collection of Songs in English*, 1701, *A Choice Collection of Italian Ayres for All Sorts of Voices, Violin or Flute*, 1703. According to Grove he died in Cambridge, 1724. The celebrated episode of his being forced to sing to the king of Poland is related in Pulver and the *D. N. B.*

Another anonymous setting, single sheet folio, London 1746?

34. Since my words, though ne'er so tender
John Christopher Smith, *Lyric Poems*

35. Since we your husband daily see
John Christopher Smith, *Lyric Poems*

36. Soft Cupid, wanton, am'rous Boy
John Travers, *Eighteen Canzonets*, no. 13.

37. Some kind angel, gently flying
Anonymous setting (Mr. ***), *Lyric Poems*

38. Still, Dorinda, I adore
John Christopher Smith, *Lyric Poems*

39. Strephonetta, why dy'e fly me
Willem Defesch, *Lyric Poems*

40. The Pride of every Grove I chose
Charles Frederick Weideman,[27] single sheet folio, London, 1750.

41. Thus Kitty, Beautiful and Young
Charles Dieupart,[28] *The Musical Miscellany* (London, 1731), 6. 164.
Anonymous setting, 'Fair Kitty,' single sheet folio, London, 1750?

[27] Burney (4. 672-73) says Weideman, "who came to England about 1726, was long the principal solo player on the German flute. He was a good musician; but in his productions, he never broke through the bounds of that mediocrity to which his instrument seems confined." He published many airs of the minuet and gavotte type, sonatas and duets for flute and harpsichord, and several concertos in seven or eight parts for flutes and violins. With Festing and others, he conceived the idea of a musical benevolent society which ultimately took form as the Royal Society of Musicians. His name is on the deed of trust dated 1739. In 1778 he was conductor of the King's band of music at £100 yearly. He died, according to *The Gentleman's Magazine* 52 (May 1782), May 24, 1782. The obituary notice describes him as "composer of minuets to the Court of St. James and one of his majesty's band of musicians." His name is misspelled by Burney and is often found in its German form, Karl Frederich.

[28] Dieupart, whose dates are uncertain, was a distinguished concert performer on the harpsichord and violin. He came from France to England about 1690 and gave concerts and taught pupils. In 1707 with Clayton and Haym he introduced translations of Italian operas at Drury Lane. He published *Six Suites* which was known to J. S. Bach who based his Prelude to *Suite Anglaise A*, no. 1, on the gigue of Dieupart's first suite in the same key. Thirty songs for flute and violin were published in *The Musical Miscellany*. He died in London about 1740 in mean circumstances, having sunk to the level of an ale house performer.

42. Thus to the Muses spoke the Cyprian-Dame
John Travers, *Eighteen Canzonets*, no. 3.

43. To heal the Smart a Bee has made.[29]
Anonymous setting, *Amaryllis* (London, 1750?), 2. 63.
Reprinted, 'The Bee,' single sheet folio, London, 1760?
and in *The London Magazine* 40 (October 1772).
The Catalogue of Printed Music lists another single sheet folio, London, 1775?

44. Touch the lyre on every string
Willem Defesch, *Lyric Poems*

45. Well! I will never more complain
Willem Defesch, *Lyric Poems*

46. When Bibo thought fit from the world to retreat
John Travers, *Eighteen Canzonets*, no. 4.
Reprinted by R. Faulkner, London, 1775, and Longman, Clementi and Co., London, 1780.

47. While blooming Youth, and gay Delight
Maurice Greene,[30] *The Musical Miscellany* (London, 1731), 6. 6.
Reprinted, single sheet folio, London, 1735? and 1740?

48. While from our Looks, fair Nymph, You guess
Charles Dieupart, *The Musical Miscellany* (London, 1731), 5. 52.
Samuel Howard,[31] *The Gentlemen's Magazine* 13 (April 1743). 214.

[29] Not included in Waller's edition. Attributed to Prior in Amaryllis: *Consisting of such Songs as are most esteemed for Composition and Delicacy and Sung at the Public Theatres or Gardens* (London [1750?]), 2. 63. Noted by Eves, f. n. p. 371.

[30] 1695-1755. Greene, the leading church musician of his time, began as a chorister at St. Paul's. He studied music under Richard Brind, organist of the Cathedral, and upon Brind's death in 1718 he succeeded him. In 1727 he became organist of the Chapel Royal, and three years later, on Tudway's death, Professor of Music at Cambridge. After he became master of the King's band in 1733 he composed many occasional pieces for the court. He assisted in founding the Royal Society of Musicians. In 1750 he undertook to publish in score the best English cathedral music, but his health failing, he left his collection to Boyce to complete. He was a voluminous composer of church music, and his *Forty Select Anthems* (1743) became a standard work. But he also composed three light operas, two oratorios, and many glees, catches, and songs. He set to music Pope's 'Ode on St. Cecelia's Day,' Spenser's *Amoretti*, and Addison's '*The Spacious Firmament.*'

[31] 1710-1782. Chorister of the Chapel Royal and pupil of Dr. Pepusch, Howard

John Buswell,[32] single sheet folio, London, 1750?
John Henry Mose,[33] *B. Martin's Miscellaneous Correspondence* (London, 1756), 1. 352.

49. Whilst I am scorch'd with hot Desire
Robert King,[34] *The Gentleman's Journal* 1 (1692). 27-29.

became organist of St. Clement Danes' and St. Bride's. He helped Boyce with the collection of cathedral music begun by Dr. Greene and composed several psalm and hymn tunes still widely known as 'Howard' and 'St. Brides.' He was a voluminous and popular writer of songs and cantatas. "The ballads of the late Dr. Samuel Howard which were long the delight of the natural and inexperienced lovers of music, had the merit of facility; for this honest Englishman, brought up in the Chapel Royal, preferred the style of his own country to that of any other so much, that he never staggered his belief of its being the best in the world, by listening to foreign artists or their production." (Burney, 4. 672)

[32] Buswell's dates are uncertain. He is not listed in any of the dictionaries in English. He was a chorister of the Chapel Royal in 1748, and in 1755 he became a member of the Chapel. Five songs by him survive in the British Museum, among them 'Where now are all my flatt'ring dreams of Joy' from Smollett's *Roderick Random*.

[33] There are fourteen songs by Moze in Volumes I, II, and III of *B. Martin's Miscellaneous Correspondence*. His obituary notice in *The Gentleman's Magazine* 57 (December, 1787). 1196, under December 27 runs: "In Wardour St., Soho, Mr. John Henry Moze, organist of St. Anne, Soho, the collegiate church of St. Katherine near the Tower, and the German church in the Savoy." He is probably the contributor of that name mentioned in the title of a book of hymns published in London, 1758: *Divine Melody*, in twenty four choice Hymns. The first fifteen were set to music in 2 parts by Mr. Prelleur, late Organist of Christ Church, Middlesex; the rest, chiefly by Mr. Moze, Organist.

[34] King's dates are unknown, but he flourished between 1684 and 1711. He was a member of the private music of Charles II and continued in this post under James II, William and Mary, and Anne. In 1684 he published songs in *Choice Ayres, Songs, and Dialogues* and in 1685 composed songs for *Sir Courtly Nice*. Other collections publishing his songs are *Comes Amoris, The Banquet of Music, Songs for One, Two, and Three Voices composed with a Through Basse for ye Organ or Harpsicord*, and *A Second Booke of Songs*. The two last have charmingly designed and engraved title pages and beautiful opening initials to the lyrics, being artistic examples of song-books made from copper plates. *The Theatre of Music* (1685-87) edited by Henry Purcell and John Blow contains thirteen songs by him and *Pills to Purge Melancholy* (1719) six, including a melodic setting of Wither's lyric, 'Shall I wasting in despair.' He set fifteen songs for *The Gentleman's Journal* between 1692-94. Prior's lyric was first printed without music in the June issue.

Two other lyrics by Prior, published from the Longleat MSS. by Waller in 1907, have King's music. The first, number 19 in this list, is entitled 'Song Set by Mr. K.' This is an early lyric, one of the Celia group to which number 49 belongs. The second, not in this list because by its title it was adapted to a tune, is headed 'To Mr. K——s Tune of the Prince's March.' This was published in *Comes*

have seemed "frigid and academic" to Austin Dobson, "mere wax flowers of Parnassus," [36] but these many settings prove that they pleased the men and women of the 18th century.[37]

University of California, Los Angeles.

[36] *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., 22. 359 b.

[37] Prior wrote three ballads to be sung to traditional tunes: 'Down Hall' and 'The Thief and the Cordelier' to be sung to the tune of 'King John and the Abbot of Canterbury' (published in *Pills to Purge Melancholy*, 4. 28-29) and 'The Viceroy' to be sung to the tune of 'The Lady Isabella's Tragedy or The Step-Mother's Cruelty.' Two of Prior's longer poems were set to music. 'Hymn to the Sun' in the unauthorized edition of 1707 bears this descriptive title: 'An Ode to the Returning Sun, Intended to be Sung before their late Majesties, on New-Year's Day, 1693/4, (but here Printed with Alterations; as it was performed lately at a Consort of Music, by the most eminent Masters).' In later editions the title runs: 'Hymn to the Sun. Set by Dr. Purcel, and Sung before their Majesties on New-Year's-Day, 1694.' This is not listed among Henry Purcell's compositions and does not appear in the Purcell Society Publications, although Prior in his carefully planned edition of 1718 is not likely to have made a mistake. 'Henry and Emma' was set to music by Dr. Thomas Augustine Arne: 'Henry and Emma, a new Poetical Interlude . . . with alterations and a new air and chorus, the music by Dr. Arne. London.' This was performed on March 31, 1749, at Covent Garden. A. Nicoll in his 18th century play list notes 'Songs Printed 8°, 1749.' Another alteration by Henry Bates, not printed, was performed at Mrs. Hartley's benefit at Covent Garden, April 13, 1774.

The Variorum Spenser

The Variorum Edition of Edmund Spenser, inaugurated by the late Edwin Greenlaw, has progressed through seven volumes, which contain the whole text of *The Faerie Queene* (six volumes) with complete apparatus, and the Minor Poems, volume one. The edition has been under the general editorship of Edwin Greenlaw, Charles G. Osgood, Frederick Morgan Padelford, and Ray Heffner. As already published it is as follows:

Volume I, *The Faerie Queene*, Book One; special editor, Frederick Morgan Padelford

Volume II, *The Faerie Queene*, Book Two; special editor, Edwin Greenlaw

Volume III, *The Faerie Queene*, Book Three; special editor, Frederick Morgan Padelford

Volume IV, *The Faerie Queene*, Book Four; special editor, Ray Heffner

Volume V, *The Faerie Queene*, Book Five; special editor, Ray Heffner

Volume VI, *The Faerie Queene*, Books Six and Seven; the general editors and James G. McManaway ,Dorothy E. Mason, and Brents Stirling

The price of each of these six volumes is $6.00 net, sold only in sets.

Later volumes will include the Minor Poems, Spenser's prose, and important apparatus. The Minor Poems, with Professor Osgood as special editor, will appear in two volumes. **The price of these volumes is $7.50 each. Volume one is ready and volume two is in an advanced stage of preparation.**

The Variorum Edition, as at present planned, will include, beside the Prose, specially edited by Dr. Rudolf Gottfried, a volume of allusions to Spenser up to the year 1700, brief studies of his influence on English poetry, a new life of Spenser by Professor Alexander C. Judson, a Glossary, and an Index to all the volumes. When thus completed it will be, as the general editors hoped and planned, the definitive edition of Spenser, indispensable in every library of English literature and of prime importance to a serious student of Tudor England.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND